

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XX. No. 15 }
WHOLE No. 509 }

JANUARY 18, 1919

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR

Chronicle

The War.—During the week, in spite of the armistice there was heavy fighting on several of the European fronts, and in Siberia. In and around Posen there were

Military Movements, almost continuous conflicts between

Jan. 6, p.m.-Jan. 13, a.m. the Germans and the Poles. The Germans captured Ozarikau by as-

sault, but on the arrival of Polish reserves were compelled to withdraw to the north bank of the Netze. Fighting was also reported at Wissenhoehe and Wissek, the struggle here favoring the Germans. In Riga and its vicinity, Russian Bolsheviki clashed with German and other troops; English forces landed to restore order. Poles and Ruthenians were reported attacking and counter-attacking around Lemberg, Galicia. After severe fighting in Vilna, Russian Bolsheviki captured that city from the Polish forces which but a few days before had driven them out. South of Murmansk and Archangel, Allied and American forces were steadily engaged against Bolsheviki battalions. According to the latest information received by the Allied Intelligence Department, the troops opposing the Allied and American contingent on this front were fairly well organized and officered, not by Germans but by Russians and Letts. At Perm, Central Russia, Czecho-Slovak divisions were reported to have won a considerable victory over the Bolsheviki, capturing 31,000 prisoners and great quantity of supplies. In Southern Russia, French forces were said to have landed at Odessa and to have moved inland towards Kiev. There was fighting also around Omsk in Siberia. Conditions are unsettled in Transbaikalia. Allied and American units continued in control of Vladivostok and the surrounding territory.

The last city of importance in which Mr. Wilson stopped on his return trip from Rome to Paris was Turin in northern Italy. On his arrival there he was greeted by

The President at Turin and the Peace Congress the Mayor of the city, who called him the "new apostle of liberty." In spite of the drizzling rain an immense

crowd lined the streets and gave him an enthusiastic welcome. One of the most picturesque features of the visit to Turin was the gathering of more than a thousand mayors of towns and villages to greet the President. Almost every township and county community was represented, as well as every walk of life and condition of society. After a round of receptions, which included the

bestowal of the freedom of the city upon him, a luncheon at which the Cardinal-Archbishop was present and a visit to the University, where he received an honorary degree, the President left for Paris.

The Supreme Council of the Peace Conference, consisting of President Wilson, the Premiers and Foreign Ministers of Great Britain, France and Italy, together with Marshal Foch, met January 12 at the French Foreign Office to make arrangements for the procedure of the Conference January 13, at which the full delegations were present.

Germany.—Violent fighting between the Spartacans and the government troops has taken place in the streets of Berlin. The rioters were driven from the heart

The Spartacan Uprisings of the city and are occupying the suburbs. The inner city is comparatively quiet, although patrolled by strong detachments of government troops. Newspaper Row, in which the offices of the leading "bourgeois" dailies are situated, was the scene of some of the severest struggles. The bourgeoisie, although politically not in sympathy with the Socialist Government, consider it at present as the only protector of law and order, and German army officers in Berlin have taken the oath to support Noske, who stands in charge of the Government's measures of defense. The latest despatches report the defeat of the Spartacans. The Spartacan trenches in the Tiergarten were captured by the government troops, the *Vorwärts* building was won and the doors of the *Tageblatt* were broken open with a tank and at other points also the revolutionists were beaten back. About 1,300 persons were reported killed in the various engagements. In his appeal to the people Premier Ebert says:

Citizens.—The Spartacus element is battling for complete power. The Government, which will in two days bring about a free decision of the people, is to be overthrown. The people shall not be permitted to make a free decision. You have seen the results where the Spartacus adherents rule. All personal freedom and safety is abolished, the press suppressed and traffic interrupted. Portions of Berlin have been the scenes of bloody battles. Others are without light, water and provisions. Depots are being stormed and the provisioning of soldiers and civilians has been prevented. The Government is taking all necessary measures to destroy this domination of frightfulness and prevent its return. You will not have to wait long for these decisive measures. Have patience for yet a little while.

Rioting is reported to have occurred in Dresden, Hamburg, Augsburg and Dusseldorf. According to the *Münster Anzeiger*, the Spartacans stormed the local prison and set free 170 criminals. At Mulheim, during a strike demonstration, all the newspaper buildings were seized. The *General Anzeiger* appeared the next morning as the *Red Flag*. The revolutionary workers of the city at the same time forbade the issuance of any other newspaper. The Government is confident it can quell the uprisings: "The organized might of the people will make an end of suppression and anarchy," says Ebert. "The isolated success of the enemies of freedom, which are being exaggerated by them in a ridiculous manner, are of passing importance."

The latest despatches announce that Luxemburg has also been proclaimed a republic.

According to a special cable to the *New York Times*, the Centrist party is making strenuous efforts to curb the Socialist movement. It has called upon all the foes

**The New Centrist
Party**

of destructive radicalism to join its ranks and proclaims that it will be a truly Christian popular party. This step is achieving success. Professor Dunkelmann of Berlin, a Protestant theologian, calls on all Protestants to join the Catholics in a controlling Christian party for the settlement of foreign and domestic affairs of state. The Protestant Church, he says, would be unable to put a powerful political party into the field, but the Centrist party has both political ability and experience. The opportunity of the Protestant Church therefore lies in joining with the Centrists in this emergency. An adequate counterweight against the three branches of the Social Democracy can be obtained only by a solid phalanx of all the middle-class parties: "It is the mission of the new Centrist party, as a Christian popular party, to form the nucleus of this phalanx around which all other well-balanced elements, and especially those of the Protestant faith, will be able to rally." He then quotes the following declaration of the Centrist party:

The new Centrist party is a Christian popular party, membership in which is not limited to any particular denomination. All citizens of the nation who are of the Christian religion may join in regarding it as a foundation for political activity.

The Protestant elements already contributed largely to the New Year's demonstrations of the Centrists, the public raising of a cross in Berlin, which was the signal for the new crusade.

Great Britain.—The new Cabinet was announced on January 10. The members of the Government are: Premier and First Lord of the Treasury, David Lloyd George; Lord Privy Seal, A. Bonar

The New Cabinet Law; President of the Council, Earl Curzon of Kedleston; Ministers without Portfolio, George Nicoll Barnes and Sir Eric Geddes; Lord Chancellor, Sir F. E. Smith; Secretary for Home Affairs, Edward Shortt; Foreign Secretary, Ar-

thur Balfour; Secretary for the Colonies, Viscount Milner; Secretary of War and the Air Ministry, Winston Churchill; Financial Secretary to the War Office, H. W. Forster; Secretary for India, Edwin S. Montagu; First Lord of the Admiralty, Walter Hume Long; Parliamentary Secretary, Thomas J. McNamara; President of the Board of Trade, Sir Albert Stanley; Department of Overseas Trade Development, Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland; President of the Local Government Board, Dr. Christopher Addison; Secretary of Agriculture, R. E. Prothero; Minister of Education, H. A. L. Fisher; Food Controller, G. H. Roberts; Minister of Shipping, Sir J. P. Maclay; Minister of Labor, Sir Robert Stevenson; Home Minister for Pensions, Sir Laming Worthington-Evans; Minister for National Service and Reconstruction, Sir Auckland Geddes; Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, the Earl of Crawford; Attorney-General, Sir Gordon Hewart; Solicitor-General, Sir Ernest Pollock; Postmaster-General, A. H. Illingworth; Paymaster-General, Sir Joseph Compton-Rickett; Chancellor of the Exchequer, Austen Chamberlain; Secretary for Scotland, Robert Munro; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Viscount French; Chief Secretary for Ireland, Sir James Ian Macpherson. It would not be the precise truth to say that these appointments have met universal approbation. The *Times* says that the Cabinet "comes as a deep disappointment," the *Express* observes that it is "the old troupe performing in slightly different roles," the *Chronicle* consoles itself with the hope that "there will be changes" very soon, and the *Daily News* remarks that this extraordinary list looks like the result of "a malignant joke."

Home News.—Towards the middle of the week the Marine Workers operating in the harbor of New York finally declared the strike which had been for some time *The President and the* threatening. They demanded an *Marine Workers' Strike* eight-hours working day and an increase of wages. For three days the strike paralyzed New York's tidewater traffic, greatly hampering the movement of troops as well as of food supplies, thus causing great inconvenience and suffering. After vain efforts at an agreement between the New York Boat Owners Association and the strikers and the failure of the parties to make a joint submission to the War Board, the matter at last was carried to the President. The President's intervention and request that the War Labor Board reopen its hearings and render a decision in the controversy prompted the labor leaders to order the men back to work pending the action of the Labor Board. The message of the President cabled from Paris to the War Labor Board asking it to reopen the question and to make a finding, with the understanding that the Marine Workers should go back to work pending a settlement, is as follows:

I have been informed by the Secretary of Labor as to the serious situation which has developed in the Port of New York

and the strike of marine workers which seriously crippled the movements of troops and supplies. Consider this a very grave emergency and understand that it has arisen because the parties to the controversy failed to make a joint submission to the National War Labor Board. I earnestly request that you take up this case again and proceed to make a finding. I appreciate the honesty and sincerity of the board in announcing on Wednesday that it could not promise a final decision in the controversy without a formal submission from all parties, but I am sure that the War and Navy Departments, the Shipping Board, and Railroad Administration and any other governmental agencies interested in the controversy, will use all the power which they possess to make your finding effective, and I also believe that private boat-owners will feel constrained by every consideration of patriotism in the present emergency to accept any recommendation which your board may make. Although the National War Labor Board, up to the signing of the armistice, was concerned solely with the prevention of stoppage of war work and the maintenance of production of materials essential to the conduct of the war, I take this opportunity also of saying that it is my earnest hope that in the present period of industrial transition arising from the war, the board should use all means within its power to stabilize conditions and to prevent industrial dislocation and warfare.

Stephen J. Condon, Secretary of the Marine Workers' Affiliation, announced that the Committee of the Affiliation had decided to abide by the President's request and order the men back to work as soon as possible. He explained that it would take some time to reach and notify the members of the various unions. By January 13 the strikers were back at work.

On January 11 Walker D. Hines, Assistant Director General of Railroads, was appointed by President Wilson to succeed William Gibbs McAdoo as Director General. The new Director stated on his appointment that he intended to carry out the policies of his former chief. Like Mr. McAdoo, Mr. Hines believes that the period of Federal control over the railroads should be extended to five years or else the roads should be returned as speedily as possible to their owners. Mr. Hines was born in Kentucky in 1870. He is a graduate of Ogden College and an LL.B. of the University of Virginia. He is a specialist in Interstate Commerce and Railroad legislation as well as a practical railroad man.

Ireland.—Sinn Fein was busy during the week with demands for the release from prison of thirty-four members elected to Parliament. These men are still held in

Sinn Fein Activity

British jails* without indictment or charge. *Nationality*, a Sinn Fein organ, pleads for diplomatic methods, but adds that if these fail, the "Irish people must act in a way the British Government cannot ignore." The paper says:

The people can in a hundred ways upset the operations of the British government in Ireland. We already have dealt with the way in which "laying down tools" can be done. It is a good way and will be adopted in good course. The national assembly will issue orders as to other means as circumstances arise.

On January 9 duly elected Sinn Feiners sent out from Dublin a draft of a constitution with this preamble:

WHEREAS, The people of Ireland never have relinquished their claim to separate nationhood, and

WHEREAS, The Provisional Government of the Irish Republic at Easter, 1916, in the name of the Irish people, and continuing the fight made by previous generations, reasserted the inalienable right of the Irish nation to sovereign independence and reaffirmed the determination of the Irish people to achieve it, and

WHEREAS, The proclamation of an Irish republic at Easter, 1916, and the supreme courage and the glorious sacrifices of the men who gave their lives to maintain it, have united the people of Ireland under the flag of the Irish Republic, we, the delegated representatives of the Irish people, in congress assembled declare the following to be the Constitution of the Sinn Fein.

The document then sets forth that Sinn Fein aims at securing international recognition of Ireland as an independent republic, a task made the easier by the fact that in the last election Ireland by an almost overwhelming majority of votes self-determined itself in accordance with the principles for which England, France and the United States fought. A constituent assembly, the reports says, will be convoked to formulate measures for the welfare of the people. The measures specified are the introduction of a protective system for industries and commerce by the combined action of the county and urban councils, the poor-law boards, the harbor boards and other bodies directly responsible to the Irish people; the establishment of a consular service and of a mercantile marine for direct trading with foreign countries; the development of mineral resources; the establishment of a national stock exchange, a national civil service, and Sinn Fein courts of arbitration; the development of transit facilities, of waste lands, and of sea fisheries; the reform of education on a national and industrial basis; the abolition of the poor-law system, with relief for the infirm and aged and the employment of idle able-bodied persons on public works.

The new Cabinet is looked upon as an ominous sign for Ireland. The reputation of all the members that have to do with that country, except Macpherson's, are well known in America. The latter is of Scotch origin, the son of the carrier between Kingussie and Aviemore; as a student in Edinburgh he ran Strachey, editor of the *Spectator*, as the member for the University. Later he went to London, lived in the philanthropic Rowton House, from which he contributed occasional book reviews to the *Spectator*. Becoming a Liberal member for Sutherlandshire he was accustomed to interpellate the Postmaster General with such questions as: "Is it true, Sir, that you succeeded in sending to France so many million letters and so many thousand packages without loss?" Asquith soon appointed him Assistant Under-Parliamentary Secretary for War, an office from which he dispensed patronage in accordance with Liberal desires. He defended the officers who fired upon Mrs. Sheehy-Skeffington's house and secured the D. S. O. for the officer in command. He voted for Home Rule in 1912, '13, '14 and then announced he would never do so again. On Asquith's downfall he was the only Liberal office holder of gentile blood who retained his place. He

has of course been knighted. The Irish policy of men of this stamp will be awaited with interest. In this regard it is interesting to note that Sir Horace Plunket will be their agent in America.

Philippine Islands.—Among the measures brought before the Philippine Congress during October and the early part of November was one to appropriate 1,000,000 pesos for the support of student *pensionados* in the United States, another urges woman suffrage, a third restricts the immigration of Asiatic aliens, a fourth prohibits the sale of imported intoxicants, a fifth recommends the division of the islands into twelve departments instead of the present provinces, each to be ruled by a departmental governor, a sixth would make All Saints' Day a legal holiday to correspond to the American Memorial Day, and a seventh proposes the creation of a commission for the extension of public education in the Philippines. Another bill, which seems to be inspired by hostility to the Church, recommends the "expropriation" of ecclesiastical estates in Laguna, Bataan, Batangas and Rizal, the *haciendas* in question being valued at 5,000,000 pesos. The Manila *Bulletin* innocently remarks: "The measure aims to distribute these lands among the tenants when secured, and liberate them from alleged abuses to which they have been subjected."

More direct in its attack on religious liberty is a bill which was favorably reported back to the Senate early in November, and which forbids all ministers of religion who are not citizens of the United States to perform marriages. The bill is obviously aimed at the Spanish clergy. With the apparent object of showing how "rich" the Church in Manila is still, and thus work up public opinion against Catholicism, a Senatorial "investigation" has been going on of certain corporations in which Catholic ecclesiastics are said to hold stock. Attorney Blanco, who charges the Dominican Friars with being in control of the "Salucan Development Company," frankly confessed his animus against the Church, saying:

The Friars have been the cause of the Philippine revolution, the cause of all the big agrarian conflicts in these islands, the cause of retarding the country's development, and the moment the Friars of all Orders pack up their trunks and leave this archipelago, these islands will become happy and more progressive.

When asked why he was so interested in the Salucan Development Company, Blanco replied that he has "always hated the Friars." Attorney Chisote, on the other hand, denied before the Senate Committee that Dominicans or any Friars have an interest in the company.

On November 7 Sergio Asmeño, speaker of the House, secured the unanimous approval of the Representatives for an amendment providing that the Philippine Legislature should request the Congress of the United States to grant immediate independence to the Philippines and asking President Wilson to include the islands in the

Peace Conference. The President of the Philippine Senate, heading a commission presenting the request, was to sail for the United States in the middle of November, but the journey has now been put off till President Wilson's return to Washington.

Rome.—Towards the close of the year just past the Holy Father sent to Mgr. Alexander Kakowski, Archbishop of Warsaw, this letter which forms a remarkable document in Polish history:

Letter to the Archbishop of Warsaw. In the grave crisis which is passing over Europe, we cannot resist the promptings of our affection to send to you and to the noble Polish nation a word of comfort and hope. History has recorded in letters of gold what Poland has done for Christianity and for European civilization; but, alas, it also has to record the evil with which Europe has repaid its merits. After having violently despoiled it of political independence, it has endeavored in certain quarters to deprive it of its Catholic faith and its very nationality; but with admirable resistance, the Poles have known how to preserve both one and the other, and today after surviving an oppression of more than a century *Polonia semper fidelis*, is more active than ever.

The Holy See, which loved Poland at the height of its glory, loves it still more, if that be possible, in the depths of its misfortunes, even as a mother's love for her children increases with their increasing unhappiness. We cannot but recall that the only one, during the dismemberment of Poland, who set himself to maintain, though in the event without success, the nationality and independence of Poland, was Pope Clement XIV, of happy memory, who wrote to all the Catholic sovereigns in the strongest of terms. It is well also to record the fact that, during the long years of Polish martyrdom, while others merely watched in silence the oppressor's exercise of brutal force, our predecessors, Gregory XVI and Pius IX, lifted their voices in vigorous protest in behalf of the oppressed. When the story of the Catholic Church in Poland during the eighteenth century is published, with the authentic documents in our archives, and we hope it will appear soon, more light will be thrown on the indescribable sufferings of the Polish people and the unceasing, truly maternal solicitude of the Holy See to render them assistance.

But, infinite thanks be to the Lord, the dawn of the resurrection of Poland is at last appearing. It is our ardent desire that it may be restored to its full independence at the earliest possible date, and that it may take its place in the congress of nations and continue its history as a civil and Christian nation; and it is our fond hope that at the same time all the other nations, non-Catholic nations included, that have hitherto been subject to Russia, may be allowed to decide their own lot and develop and prosper according to their native genius and their own individual resources.

In the hope of seeing the realization of these wishes of ours in the near future, we desire, in addition to the provision we have recently made for an enlarged and more adequate establishment of the Catholic Hierarchy in that land, to give to you, Venerable Brother, and through you to the Polish people, a further and more solemn proof of our good-will and confidence; and to this end it is our purpose, at the first consistory which the Lord shall grant us to hold, to elevate you to the dignity of the cardinalate. The sacred purple, besides being an acknowledgment and a recompense of your esteemed sacerdotal virtues and your signal merits, both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs, will be at the same time, as we hope, a still stronger bond between Poland and the Chair of Peter.

The letter closes with a prayer to Our Lady of Czestochowa to be propitious to her faithful people.

The Logic of the Higher Criticism

J. D. TIBBITS

NO one who glances even cursorily at the non-Catholic religious literature of the day can fail to be impressed with the importance which it attaches to the Higher Criticism of the Sacred Scriptures. There is perhaps no single cause which has contributed in nearly so great a degree to the change which has, of recent years, affected every sect of Protestantism, and which has issued, at length, in what is called the New Theology. The relation between the two seems to be little else than that of absolute dependence, for it would be quite as impossible to think of the one without the other, as it would be even to imagine the other without the one. That the New Theology should have been derived from a different source is as inconceivable as that the Higher Criticism should have produced a different result.

And as this logical connection appears so palpably and so unmistakably clear, it can hardly do other than suggest an inquiry as to the logic upon which the Higher Criticism is itself sustained. Is it or is it not susceptible of rational demonstration? This is an important question for two reasons, first, because it is so widely accepted as a method of apprehending facts, and second, because it is the adopted system of so many who stand in the very first rank of scholarship. And its importance will be all the more apparent if we do but consider the nature of the revolution which it has wrought in modern Protestant thought. The difference between the New Theology and the old consists not merely in the changing of a creed, or even in the denying of a creed. It is an entirely new conception of religion, and, to a considerable extent, a new conception of life. What, then, is the rational nature of the cause, adequate to the production of so vast an effect? I propose briefly to describe its method, and to subject that method to an equally brief analysis; for in no other way is it possible to estimate the value of much that is taken for granted in the contemporary non-Catholic world, and which is assumed to be, for all practical purposes, self-evident.

Speaking in a broad sense, the method of the higher critics divides itself into two elements. The first of these may, for convenience sake, be termed the scientific; the second, the inferential. The scientific element contents itself solely with observing and classifying facts; and though it represents the more scholarly part of the process it also represents that part which is less striking, and which is consequently of little or no general interest.

The second element is engaged in drawing inferences from the facts presented by the first. It therefore drafts to a comparatively small extent upon the scholarship of the critic. Its loss, however, in this regard obtains ample compensation from the sensational character of its conclusions. An audience is invariably commanded; and

this audience, being in the main both uncritical and untrained, will be quick to impute to this second and almost wholly speculative element the pure erudition of the first.

The exact manner in which these two elements combine in actual operation finds one of many possible illustrations in the so-called and ever-present "Synoptic Problem." In its examination of the Gospels the scientific element notes a curious similarity attaching to the accounts given by the Synoptic writers of the healing of the paralytic. The precise words, "Then saith He to the paralytic," appear in all three, and not only are the words in all three precise, but they are, in each instance, enclosed in parentheses. The inferential element then steps in, and using this, in conjunction with other more or less similar illustrations, pronounces the conclusion that the Synoptists copied their several accounts from a single anterior source.

Now with the truth or falsity of this particular conclusion, I am not at all concerned, but the danger of the method by which it is reached must be apparent to anyone. That many inferences are perfectly valid, every logician will admit; but it hardly takes a logician to distinguish between a valid inference and an unprovable guess, while the fact that many of the conclusions of the critics are nothing more nor less than the merest guesswork is shown by the differences, both existing and persisting, among them. The points upon which they are in substantial agreement fall into relative insignificance.

But the essential laxity of the whole scheme is even clearer if we do but realize the truth that a third element has already entered in; that it has been all along in practical control of the second; and that it has cast the deciding vote in every judgment. That element is the personality which each critic brings to bear upon the problem, and which, consciously or unconsciously, must add the final touch of color to the result. Its importance can hardly be overestimated. By it, every prejudice and prepossession gains admittance to the process; because of it no bias, theological or otherwise, can be excluded. If the impressions of the critic incline him to belief in the supernatural, his conclusions may be relatively conservative. If, on the contrary, they are of a radical type, so also will be his judgment. So eminent a scholar as the late Dr. Charles W. Briggs concluded that the Resurrection was proved by the Gospels. The late Dr. James D. Martineau, perhaps equally eminent, concluded that it was not. Were such a discrepancy of result the exception rather than the rule, it would, of course, be negligible. The fact is, however, that it is the rule rather than the exception.

What, then, must be our estimate of this curious process, viewed purely as an instrument for apprehending truth? We may freely allow that it has given birth

to many plausible speculations, that it has proposed many striking theories, that it has been not infrequently suggestive. All this, however, is beside the point. The real question is, has it produced one solid fact logically competent to revolutionize the theology of the ages? In its very method is the answer contained. Facts are used by it only as stepping stones to theories, and as bridging the chasm between objective and subjective. Its value, therefore, lies chiefly in the efficiency with which it registers impressions, and the skill with which it clothes them in the language of learning.

And the further question remains as to just what light such a system can possibly cast upon the problems peculiar to the present day. We have seen that it has resulted in the New Theology; that the New Theology asserts itself to be essentially a moral movement; and that it is unceasing in its claim that it translates the message of Christ into the language of the twentieth century. But after all, what precept of Christ has it given us which was unknown to St. Augustine and St. Jerome? And how can it possibly deal with Christ's at-

titude toward matters of which its sources are necessarily silent? Can it infer from His treatment of Pharaism what would be His treatment of Socialism? Or can it bring Him into relation with all the moral and economic evils distinctive of our age? Paradoxical as it may sound, the method of the Higher Criticism and the New Theology alike is essentially and above all else antiquarian. It is dependent, in last analysis, upon dead writers and dead languages. From its very nature it can never speak with a living voice nor can its message possess significance for living men. It has confined Christ in a literary prison which is bounded by the walls of internal and external evidences, and from which its own principles forbid escape, despite the continuous procession of efforts which its history records, and of which it is itself merely the last.

The fact that it is compelled to offer this system to thinking men as the latest theological product of a critical and enlightened age is at once a concession of the helplessness of the older Protestantism and a condemnation of the new.

Catholic Publicity Again

MICHAEL WILLIAMS

A CORRESPONDENT of AMERICA, Mr. William F. Markoe, requests me to state through the columns of this journal, "for the benefit of all who are interested in Catholic publicity," whether my articles on this subject "have borne any fruit, produced any tangible results," or led to any progress at all. The question is rather embarrassing, for nobody knows better than the present writer that progress in Catholic publicity is in no degree bound up with his own articles; but, just the same, the subject is such a tremendously important one that I gladly take advantage of the opportunity opened up by Mr. Markoe to continue its discussion.

Since the appearance of my articles in AMERICA, I have had some practical experience in Catholic publicity. When the United War Work Campaign was organized I became attached to the headquarters of the western division, in San Francisco. The western division comprised the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Montana, and California. My duties in the main were concerned with Catholic publicity, seeing to it that the National Catholic War Council and the Knights of Columbus were adequately represented in the vast amount of publicity issued by the main committee in New York, and distributed through the various divisional headquarters. The theory was, that each of the seven welfare organizations united in the campaign should receive its just proportion of representation in publicity, as allotted by the wise men of the east, at central headquarters in New York. Like all theories, however, this one was susceptible of considerable adjustment

and variation from program. A fortunate circumstance, too; for this particular theory was soon discovered to be a mighty poor one.

Like many of the plans formed by "efficiency experts" when drawing up great, centralized schemes it was too confoundingly rigid, mechanical, doctrinaire. It left out the element of human nature, an element of particular value in advertising and publicity. Of course, it was highly "economical" and "systematical" and all the rest of it, but "canned" publicity, like canned goods of all sorts, is after all but a sorry substitute for fresh, home-grown and home-made food; especially for home consumption. I mean, in particular, this: that instead of relying so much on publicity prepared at central headquarters for use throughout the whole country, the publicity experts of the United War Campaign should have left a great deal of the publicity to be originated in and for the different departments, and the different States. But as we seem to be headed straight, and speeding rapidly, toward centralized government, and Federalized schools, and, probably, a Federal Department of National Morality to see to it that clergymen preach the orthodox type of State subservience, our experience of centralized publicity during the War Work Campaign may prove highly educational in the long run.

However, at the time, its rigidity was tempered by local initiative to a considerable degree. In San Francisco, for example, the publicity department of the campaign accepted from Mr. Robert G. Drady and myself more than fifty distinctively Catholic news stories and special articles over and above the Catholic stories sent out to

the western department from New York. These were distributed to more than 2,000 newspapers throughout the eight States mentioned, besides Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands; and as the clipping agency proved, were freely used. Mr. Drady, a capable and enthusiastic Catholic journalist, accomplished most important work, such as a whole half-page article on the war work of the Knights of Columbus in one of the leading San Francisco newspapers. In addition to the stories and articles prepared by Mr. Drady and myself, and distributed through the general publicity channels of the War Work organization, we also maintained a special service of articles to all the Catholic newspapers in our division, a service freely used by many of these journals, and ignored by others. On the whole, however, the results of our work were highly satisfactory. We not only obtained a representation of Catholic interests far in excess of what we should have had if we had merely relied upon the "canned stuff" from the East; but we also had time, and opportunity and proper assistance to place a number of special Catholic stories in big daily newspapers.

For example—and I tell this incident because it throws light on still another problem of Catholic, and general, publicity—there was one occasion when we were able to obtain three columns in a daily newspaper of very large circulation for a report of a Catholic sermon, dealing not with any particular war issue or "burning question" of the hour, but with Catholic doctrine which is an issue of eternity, not simply of time. It happened as follows. A national lecturer of the Christian Science humbuggery came to town and delivered a lecture. The newspaper in question the next day reported it in three columns, with a "five-column head." A national lecturer of the Catholic Church, one of the justly celebrated Paulist Fathers, had given a lecture for non-Catholics the same night. Not a word about that, however, in the newspaper in question. So I called up the editor of that paper, and asked him to print a three-column report of the Paulist's sermon, with a five-column head. Catholics, I pointed out, number probably twenty times the size of the Christian Science body in San Francisco. Why should we be ignored, and the Christian Science lecture printed, as the editorial introduction to its text averred, "because of its general public interest?" Of course, being a newspaperman myself, I already knew the answer to my question. Christian Scientists get out and hustle for their cult. Catholics are indifferent to the spread of their Faith. Christian Scientists collect and spend huge sums for advertising and press propaganda. Catholics hate to support even their best and most worthy periodicals. Christian Scientists have expert publicity men and women in every large city and town. Catholics occasionally write an angry or sarcastic or complaining letter to this editor or that editor, but they neglect even the most rudimentary means for obtaining adequate press publicity in a permanent and systematic manner. Chris-

tian Scientists, in one word, are more than abreast of the spirit of the times; they are in advance of it. Witness, for proof, the fact of their daily newspaper: one of the best in the United States: produced by a mere handful of men and women, when compared with our many-millioned Church. But Catholics, in our country, in this most important matter, are deplorably yet unmistakably behind the times. Knowing these facts, I knew also that the report of the Christian Science lecture had been bought and paid for. However, I also knew that there is a law demanding that paid reading matter be marked as such; be marked "advertising," so that people may know what they are reading. And, finally, I knew that the newspaper had winked at this law, the wink being induced, of course, by the Christian Scientists not only "holding the thought" thereof, but also holding the purse wide open. Therefore, I pretended to be surprised only when the editor, after duly hemming and hawing, wanted to know how many hundred copies of the paper I would be prepared to buy, *if* the report of the Paulist sermon should be printed. I told him that *if* Christian Science lectures were of general public interest, so also were Catholic sermons, and as he had not told the public that the lecture report was paid for, perhaps he would print the sermon without any further haggling. Which he did.

I have told this incident at such length because it is, I think, very instructive. It shows what we may do when we are organized; when we may pay attention to Catholic publicity in more than an accidental and desultory fashion. Those who work for the spirits of darkness and confusion, even though they do so, as charity suggests, in mistaken zeal such as the Christian Scientists; those who work for the spread of State Socialism, and Spiritism, and Mormonism, and paganism of many types, those, too, who labor in the interest of the heretical and bewildered cults of our separated brethren, are all cultivating assiduously the power of the press; and we are not doing so.

This, then, is the answer I would make to Mr. Markoe and all others interested in Catholic publicity. The United War Work Campaign demonstrated in a practical fashion the desirability and the feasibility of organized and efficient Catholic publicity methods. During that campaign things were done. These things opened the eyes of many who before had been blind to the importance of this work. Converts to the cause were gained, some of them being in high quarters indeed. A spirit of hope has been aroused. It is not conceivable that we can always go on as at present. Nevertheless, despite the work accomplished during the United War Campaign, despite the results achieved, and the spreading of faith in the idea, the sad fact remains that this extension of practical experience confirms what past experience had told me, namely, that the Catholic laity, especially that portion of it known as "our wealthy and prominent Catholics," are still benumbed with apathy, lame with

impotence, sluggish with the slow poison of indifference.

What are we to do?

May I, for once, speak out my whole mind in my answer? Well, then, first let me say what one of the best-known journalists in the English-speaking world said the other day in the course of a remarkable dispatch to the *New York Times* concerning the spread of Bolshevism, namely, "Forgive me if I presume to preach in the columns of a newspaper." This earnest and truth-seeking writer was forced to this apology because in reporting the awful menace of lawlessness now arising from the gutters and the stews of our shattered so-called civilization, he was obliged to confess that to him there seems no hope for the restoration of society unless "there is a spiritual reconstruction first." I, too, apologize for bordering upon the privileges of the pulpit, but, God knows, the time is upon us when conventionalities that hamper the utterances of what the heart feels and the judgment of the mind confirms, must be thrust aside. So I feel and I think that the question of Catholic publicity must be laid at the feet of God. We must go on talking in the ears of indifferent men and women, doing what we can to arouse them; but I feel and I think that the problem now, I speak reverently, is up to our priests, our Bishops, our pastors. I know they are in favor of practical, worthy methods of spreading the Holy Faith through means of the press. They realize more keenly than the laity the need for action. So I think they should talk to us from the pulpit; and they should lead us in prayer. The idea must be given a throbbing, burning soul of power, guided by right reason, if it is to be taken out of the domain of the abstract into the region of reality; and that soul of spiritual power it will never have until our nuns pray for it, and our children offer their Communions for it, and our priests commemorate the idea in the sanctuary. God forbid pessimism on our part, now as the war clouds disappear and peace returns, but truth compels us to recognize the menace of the new age now upon us, the menace of the godless State. Only one thing can save and sweeten human society—God's religion; but God asks His children to be the apostles of that salvation, and we, His children, seem strangely stupified. May God arouse us to our duty!

Abuses in College Athletics

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D., PH.D.

THE war brought a lull in college athletics and with it an opportunity to review some of the unfortunate tendencies that, in recent years, were so much in evidence in this department of college life. The examination of the academic conscience has given rise to some deep penitential feelings, which resulted in an open confession at the thirteenth annual convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the

Hotel Astor, New York, not long since. Dean Angell, of Chicago, set forth a series of confessions of faith, as he called them, which stigmatize a number of practices in connection with college athletics in the severest terms. Some of the articles of the athletic faith of the Chicago Dean, who is known as a thoughtful, conservative, yet progressive educator, make extremely interesting reading for those of us who, for years, have insisted that college athletics, as conducted before the war, probably more than any other single element in present-day college life, were responsible for that sad failure of education which practically all educators are ready to admit.

Dean Angell's principal article of faith, in a sense, is negative. He states: "I do not believe there is any obligation on the part of the colleges to furnish the general public with substitutes for the circus, the prize-fight, and the gladiatorial combats." Here is the problem in a nutshell. We have had a vicious circle of influences. Colleges, according to the pre-war tradition, had to have winning teams in order to attract visiting crowds to see their games. In order to have winning teams, there had to be paid a professional coach, the training table, and ever so many other costly accessories. In order to find money for these, athletics had to be made a commercial proposition; crowds had to be attracted for the sake of gate receipts, and so the vicious circle went rolling on until athletics became the most important interest in the lives of a great many students. As a consequence, education took a secondary place. As President Wilson, then of Princeton, said in one of those trenchant expressions with which he has often demonstrated his power to sum up a situation, no matter how complex: "The side-shows at the university came to be ever so much more important than the main tent," and young men's attention was so diverted from their studies that no wonder education was a failure.

It is encouraging, indeed, to have the Dean of a large university department pointedly declare:

I believe that a good deal of the professional training of athletic teams, particularly in football, has been grossly objectionable in overworking boys whose primary obligation is to the academic aims of the college. The result has often been that the boy has done neither job well, has been too exhausted to study and too much disturbed at his class deficiencies to put his whole spirit into the games.

Those of us who are physicians and have heard of the college athlete who weeps when a game is lost, who goes stale before a big game and has to be coddled, whose moods have to be studied and catered to, can scarcely fail to believe that hysterical tendencies are fostered by the preparation for big games. At any rate character is not trained. No wonder Dean Angell thinks that the spirit which is fostered is that of professionalism and not of the true amateur.

Men [he says] who play for motives other than the love of the game, men to whom victory, however won, is the controlling end, are men already on the road to professionalism, men who have in some measure sacrificed their amateurism.

Unfortunately, this false athletic spirit has carried on into life and has made men think of success as the one end of existence, and not the struggle manfully and fairly maintained no matter what the difficulties. Athletics train the bodies of our young men—that is, of the few who come directly under their influence—but are responsible for not a little of that materialistic point of view which sets success in dollars and cents, or some other easily recognizable symbol, above everything else.

In the September number of the *Atlantic Monthly* Dean Briggs, of the faculty of arts and sciences at Harvard, welcomed the opportunity which the war afforded for the reform of college athletics. He does not hesitate to say: "If we fail to learn from the war, if the great moments of the great world paralyze us and we do nothing with the opportunities, infinitely smaller, yet great in their kind, of the college athletic world, we shall join the crowded ranks of those who, whether too inert to act or too blind to see, have lost their chance." Dean Briggs, as is well known, is not an opponent of college athletics, but on the contrary one who recognizes all their possible value and deprecates only the serious abuses which have crept into them during the past few years. Very probably he must be considered what he is set down to be in the "Contributors' Column" of the *Atlantic*—"universally recognized as the truest and most judicious friend of intercollegiate athletics as they should be."

He sees very clearly the objections that are urged against college athletics and probably no one has ever stated more succinctly and more forcibly the opposing position, even though he does this to express his disagreement with it to a considerable extent. He represents the opponents of college athletics, declaring that they are

a colossal substitution of sham for reality, prostituting what should be a means to health by making it an end in itself and an end that defeats the end to which it should be an end, by endangering rather than insuring the health for which alone it exists.

This is, however, not all of the indictment against athletics made by their opponents, for as Dr. Briggs states, as emphatically as could possibly be wished, intercollegiate sport

robs study, scamps the performance of daily duty, magnifies physical prowess, nurses luxury, and is at best only an intermittent check on vice, which between periods of training rides triumphant. The very thought of thousands who squander money for tickets to games, the very sight of thousands who find games of applauding interest in a world "so full of a number of things," bears annoying witness to the mad folly of the American public, and to the pusillanimous irresponsibility of American institutions of learning that cater to this folly. [Italics inserted.]

Dean Briggs declared that such forcible expressions may be "in great part wrong," but that "they speak some patent truths that every responsible lover of his college cannot but deplore." Surely any one who has at heart

the best interests of the American college, and of education as a force for what is best in life in America, will agree with regard to the patent truth of many of the propositions. The Dean himself, now President of Wellesley, has said some very emphatic things as to "dishonest proselyting, the upsetting of relative values, and the kind of lionizing that turns the heads of boys, not to speak of those girls with whom football heroes are socially superior matinee idols." True, he confesses that the fault is not wholly the faculty's, but that all of us—faculty, alumni and American public—"had nourished a young giant until he had made a grown giant's demands. Now, as the result of the war, he has suddenly shrunk and nobody believes in over-feeding him again."

The abuses in college athletics are, after all, only a symptom of the larger unfortunate tendencies in modern American life. The particularly lamentable feature of the situation was that the colleges and universities of this country were fostering so much that made for the worst in life. Athletic abuses are just a symptom of that cult of the body, at the expense of the mind and the heart, which has been noted everywhere in American life. Popular music has become rag-time—that is, series of sounds which because of a recurrent rhythm, very like the tom-tom of the veriest savage, have an appeal to the body and set the body going in response. Our drama has become an appeal to the senses, or, to the sex feelings, and real dramatic problems as related to life in its entirety and genuine significance no longer succeed on our stage. We cultivate cleanliness of the body and seem to have forgotten that ever so much more important quality, cleanliness of mind and soul. We foster strength of body without realizing that the most important element in education is strength of will and firmness of character.

We had hoped that one of the by-products of the war would be a correction of this tendency to magnify the body at the expense of the higher part of man, for it seemed as though the fact that men found there was really something more worth while in life than life itself would surely give a fine stimulus to the quest of the highest rather than of the lowest. One of the young poets who died during the war said that we should have "to have a very different world for the millions of men whose souls had been touched by flame in the trenches." Whether our hopes will be realized or not remains to be seen. If they are not, one of the most precious results of the war will be lost and we shall have spent treasure and human lives in vain.

As Mr. Ryan, who helped so well in the large problems of the war by lifting up the air service to a high plane when it was most disappointing, said, "What we want now is not reconstruction in the sense of building over again what we had before, but renovation, so that the new world will be without the unfortunate abuses of the pre-war time."

Educators are doing well to emphasize that the two problems of intercollegiate sports and of social reform

after the war are co-ordinate problems. Their solution depends entirely on the spirit in which they are met.

Intercollegiate athletics are brought face to face with the problem that confronts America, and by the same tremendous force, the war for the mastery or the liberation of the world.

Like America, they will stand or fall according as they choose between luxury and simplicity, trickery and integrity, the senses and the spirit.

This, indeed, is the whole problem. How will it be solved?

The "Church at Home"

MARY DIXON THAYER

THE article in the January *Atlantic Monthly* by Harry Emerson Fosdick, entitled "The Trenches and the Church at Home," presents to the Catholic reader a vivid portrait of Protestantism as it exists today in all the weakness of its inconsistencies, in the division of its multitudinous sects, in its bewilderment before the "new era," its stinging doubt of its own competence, and its querulous groping after a "new Christianity" that, adapted to the spiritually awakened minds of our returning soldiers—made over, as it were, according to their demands—will appeal to them and hold their respect and attention. Withal, we feel the sincere desire of the Protestant sects to rise equal to the great task, to emerge from this period of struggle united and powerful. Says Mr. Fosdick:

While the soldier's judgment often is abrupt and fallible, we know well, when we cease poulticing our consciences with soft complacency that any impatience of the soldiers with our belated sectarian divisions is justified. For a long time now we have been concocting excuses for our lamentable situation. We have grown fluent with historical explanations of present ills, and with comforting analogies of other institutions' similar misfortunes. The day for this pleasant dalliance is over. White-wash cannot forever support rotting timbers. The hour of the Church's [Mr. Fosdick seems here to have wrongly placed his apostrophe, since he refers to a disunited Protestantism] crisis and of her splendid opportunity has struck. . . . Let the Churches proclaim social aims worth fighting for, not a mere selfish gospel of safety; let them lift up the central faiths of the Christian life, with the fringes hanging how they will [why allow the fringes to hang at all if they be admittedly unnecessary?]. Let them (the churches) make ethical negations only the shadows cast by the great light of positive ideas; let them practise as well as preach fraternity; and, doing these things, let them draw together in one common cause, because they have learned how much they all agree and how insignificantly they differ! They need not fear the return of the army, if they will do that.

Splendid advice; but we wonder whether Mr. Fosdick is quite aware of the consequences innate in the realization of his proposal. Were our various Protestant sects to "draw together" in reality, and, emphasizing their central dogmas, allow the others to "hang as they would," there would emerge a doctrine, or code of life, or whatever they would in session arrayed agree to call it, perilously resembling that of the Catholic Church. For this particular "denomination" happening, strangely enough, it must seem to Mr. Fosdick, to have existed for fourteen centuries before any of the others, constituted, indeed, the well of truth from which all later sects de-

rived whatever they were to retain as pure and unadulterated doctrine.

All else was mere protest against existing belief, rejection, formal enunciation of what they refused absolutely to accept and what, in its mere statement, is witness to the fact of the previous existence of a faith attesting the truth of precisely all they would deny. Mr. Fosdick, counseling that emphasis be laid upon the positive ideals of the various sects, and that ethical negations be relegated as shadows only, of these ideals, is robbing the Protestant sects of their fundamental *raison d'être*, which was negation in its most virile form, and to which the name itself of Protestant bears eloquent testimony. It is, of course, negation that constitutes the chasm between Protestantism and Catholicism, and just so far as this chasm is bridged by the substitution of assertion for negation, just so much the nearer will be these two great factors of modern Christendom. It is indeed strange that Mr. Fosdick, and other intelligent Protestants of the present day, who see in Catholicism only one of the myriad sects of Christendom, do not observe with interest upon closer examination, the remarkable uniqueness of this particular "sect" in its fundamental, easily perceptible and clearly verifiable strength, age, unity and magnitude as compared to all others.

What Christian denomination except the Catholic dares enumerate as her children 200,000,000 souls? Not even the combined strength of divided Protestantism could boast such a vast multitude. And this multitude, of every race, of every nation of the world, supports a universal priesthood, acknowledges a universal "head," and attests a universal and identical creed.

For generations [writes Mr. Fosdick] the churches have been calling men to fight the world's worst; their present task is, first, to see if they can somehow become once more the rallying point of the world's best. Urgently we desire these men of the army to accept Christianity; but before we succeed, many of our churches will have to get a type of Christianity that is worth the real man's while to accept.

What, exactly, does Mr. Fosdick mean in this paragraph? Plainly, that the churches are no longer the "rallying point of the world's best," and that primal Christianity has become so adulterated, so falsified, that, in its present state, it is not "worth the real man's while to accept."

For those Protestants who still cling desperately to belief in the Divinity of Christ the admission of such a fact

must be bewildering, humiliating, indeed. Who was Christ but a mere man, if the religion which He professedly came into the world to found has disintegrated, in time, into such a turmoil of confusions that it is not "worth the real man's while to accept?" Who was He, indeed, but an impostor, a madman, if what He foretold has been utterly contradicted, and what He prayed for has been left unfulfilled?

Verily, if Protestantism represented all that was left of Christianity we should be justified in seeking a "newer" and purer form, or, I think, with more reason, we should be justified in forsaking it altogether. "Atheism or Catholicism!" exclaimed Cardinal Newman; "there is no middle course." Today this truth is forced vividly upon us from the very lamentations of those who, having followed the "middle course," see in it themselves only a maze of byways among which they are, by their own admission, hopelessly lost, as they blindly wander down devious paths.

Thank God that we, who possess the only true Faith, the only Christianity in the completeness of its Divine perfection, unity, and beauty, are spared the pathetic realization that, if our religion is to survive at all it must be "made over!"

Christ's sublime prayer for the Church of which He was the corner-stone is fulfilled gloriously, through all ages, in the Catholic Communion.

And now I am not in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given me, *that they may be one as we also are*. . . . These things I speak in the world, that they may have joy filled in themselves. I have given them Thy word and the world hath hated them because they are not of the world; as I also am not of the world.

I pray not that Thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldst keep them from evil. . . . And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me. *That they all may be one*, as Thou, Father, in me and I in Thee; *that they also may be one in us that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me*.

And the glory which Thou hast given me, *I have given to them, that they may be one, as we also are one*. I in them, and Thou in me; *that they may be made perfect in one*, and the world may know that Thou hast sent me and hast loved them, as Thou hast also loved me.

Would that Mr. Fosdick and our other Protestant friends who are so much concerned over the cracks in the structure of their religion, and who are frantically attempting to prop up its foundations ere the whole tottering edifice crash in pieces about their heads—would that they, gazing upward with the eyes of sincere seekers after truth, might behold that vast city that is builded upon a mountain, that "One True Fold" which cannot be hid, that kingdom which is undivided and which alone emerges undefiled, triumphant, after nineteen centuries of persecution, in which the sublime prophecies of Christ are manifest, and to which were addressed these words of ineffable comfort and promise: "Behold! I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world!"

The Ulster Myth

J. F. CASSIDY

IN their recent election addresses some English statesmen resurrected the Ulster problem, which had almost disappeared from sight during the past four years. Mr. David Lloyd George and Mr. Winston Churchill have very definitely told the world that they stand as rigidly for the maintenance of Orange Ulster's will as for British naval supremacy. They feign friendship for democracy and self-determination in thus championing the cause of the northern province and seek to convince the world that they do so from the spirit of liberalism and sheer philanthropy. As in their navalist program, so in this, they have sought to mask their imperialistic designs beneath a fallacious plea for justice for the Orangemen, that can find no justification in any despotism menacing the rights of the men of the North. But the arguments of these two gentlemen are in no sense novel; they have come constantly in the same guise from the representatives of imperialism in England for the past hundred years.

Now the world should know, in the interests of true justice and self-determination, that the claims of imperialist England on behalf of Ulster are radically false and misleading. The Ulster question has been manufactured in England for England and by England and not for the sake of the much-tortured Irish province. Ulster has indeed been highly favored by England politically and economically, and basking in the sun of her privileges is, Leinster excepted, the most prosperous section of the Island. She has been allowed a free hand in the molding of her industrial future, whilst crushing statutes have destroyed the commercial enterprise of the rest of the country. But it must be remembered that the object of England's benevolence is not primarily the prosperity of Ulster. Wealth and affluence have been given to her that she might learn to love the giver of those good things and consign to a very secondary position the interests of the rest of her homeland. And England's bait has wrought wonders of perversity in the heart of Orange Ulster. It has made Ulster a veritable thorn in the side of Irish national aspiration and development. Orangemen blinded by prosperity have forgotten their gallant forefathers who used the convincing argument of gun and saber in the days of Grattan and Flood to wring from the Saxon commercial emancipation for Irishmen of every creed and class. They have wandered from the ways of their noble ancestors who drank the health of the Irish and French Republics in the last wild years of the eighteenth century. They have become wrapt up in self, commercialized, provincial, too narrow in their views to be even imperialists for imperialism's sake and too material to feel the finer emotions of patriotism. They have fallen down and adored the god of commercial prosperity and bartered their soul for a mess of pottage.

Another fallacy bolstering up the Ulster myth is the teaching that the Irish Presbyterian must expect persecution from the Catholics under an Irish parliament. How, in the face of the Irish reputation for tolerance in matters of religion, such a doctrine can win any credence seems difficult to understand. Anyone possessing a true knowledge of Irish character knows that nature did not give it the iron that makes the persecutor. A tyro's knowledge of Irish history should convince any unprejudiced person that the Catholic Gael who has been so grievously persecuted has been supremely tolerant towards his non-Catholic fellow-countrymen. Even today, when Catholics possess more power than ever they possessed, in every part of the country where they predominate a man's religion is no bar to office, if in other respects he be qualified for such. There are at the present moment hundreds of small towns that have Protestants in public offices with the full approval of populations that are overwhelmingly Catholic. Orange trade with the Nationalist population is very considerable, and Belfast,

despite its annual celebrations on the twelfth of July, carries on a thriving business with the South. In the political world the same liberal attitude on the part of Catholics has existed in the past and still endures. There was never a Protestant who manifested sincerity in the national cause whom Ireland did not receive with open arms. Amongst the truest, most revered and most beloved of her patriotic sons are the heroic Emmet, great-souled Mitchel and princely Parnell.

In the face of these facts Ulster has no right whatsoever to protest against the uniform application of the principle of self-determination to all Ireland. Her non-conforming population could have no just grounds for demanding separation from the rest of the country except those of tyranny in the past or a menacing despotism in the future. Her people are only a very small section of the nation. Ulster, not being a people in the national sense of the word, but an integral and natural part of a people, has no right to determine in her own way her future existence apart from the common body of the nation in which she is incorporated. Since that people of which she is a section has offered and is willing at any future date to offer sufficient guarantees under an Irish constitution for the safety of her religious and civil liberty, her protests must be regarded as unreasonable. It is more irrational on her part to seek separation from the rest of Ireland than it would be for Virginia to demand a political future outside the group of commonwealths that constitute the United States.

Besides, to isolate Ulster from Ireland would be doing a grave injustice to the majority of the nation. It would create an incurable and deadly wound in the soul of Gaelic nationhood. The Irish people cannot and will not tolerate permanent divorce from a province, the ideals and traditions of which have from time immemorial been part and parcel of its national life. Every Ulster county teems with historic relics that commemorate some of the most renowned of Irish saints, scholars and heroes. From a princely race of the north came Columbkille, one of the greatest and most beloved of the sanctified ones of the Gael. From Ulster came the Four Masters, amongst the most celebrated of Ireland's scholars and annalists. She was the region dear to the heart of Cuchulainn, the greatest hero of the Gaelic romantic tales. In days better known to history she nurtured the great Hugh O'Neill of Tyrone, who held the armies of Elizabeth at bay for many a glorious day. To surrender a portion of Gaeldom so essential to the preservation of her national individuality would be for Ireland almost suicidal. The Irish people can never consent to the sacrifice of so sacred a part of its common heritage on the altar of Orange egoism and materialism.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six-hundred words.

Catholic Students at Catholic Schools

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The attendance of Catholic students at Catholic schools is ever an important subject. Pampering of athleticism, relaxation in discipline, tampering with the curriculum, are justified or excused on the plea that students must be attracted to our high schools and colleges. Is it not time to discuss this question and to determine exactly what are the causes of the increase and decrease of students in Catholic schools? Father W. J. Bergin, C. S. V., at the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Educational Association (*Bulletin of C. E. A.*, XIV, 1, p. 59) asserted vigorously that we have too many colleges in certain places. He advocated suppression of some institutions. His figures are striking and his conclusions are deserving of much consideration. Dr. James C. Burns, C. S. C., of Holy Cross College, Washington, D. C., in many publications has discussed the figures of attendance suggestively and thoroughly, but seems to touch but incidentally upon the causes.

Let me put before you some figures about Jesuit schools in the province of Maryland-New York, and see whether they may point the way to some conclusions. I compare the number of students for October 1, 1900, with the most recent numbers available. The earlier numbers are taken from the *Woodstock Letters* and were furnished by the respective schools. The later numbers are taken chiefly from Dr. Burns' "Report on Attendance at Catholic Colleges" and from the "Catholic Directory."

In 1900 the combined numbers of Boston College and Worcester College were, for high school, 354, and for college, 390. In the meanwhile the latter college discontinued its high school. In 1916 the numbers for high school are 1,380, and for college, 1,215, an increase of more than 300 per cent in sixteen years. In 1900 there were three Jesuit high schools in New York and vicinity, having in all 536 students; in 1916 there were six high schools having more than 2,100 students, an increase of nearly 400 per cent. In 1900 there were three colleges having 250 students, and in 1916 there were three colleges with 375 students, an increase of more than 100 per cent. Now compare with these figures the corresponding figures in three Jesuit institutions in Maryland and the District of Columbia. In 1900 these three had 394 high-school students and 205 college students; in 1916 the figures are respectively 430 and 263, an increase of less than 20 per cent.

What is the significance of these figures? Some consider it a self-evident proposition that successful athletics increase the number of students. The point, however, has never been proved and investigations have shown that increase or decrease of students is not a function of successful athletics. In these Jesuit schools the increases took place without regard to athletic prowess. The curriculum had little to do with the increase. There was the same curriculum where the increase was 400 per cent as where the increase was 20 per cent.

What then would seem to be the cause of the increase? Who form by far the larger number of students in any college? Those from the immediate neighborhood. Where the Catholic population increases swiftly, there will be a swift increase in students; where Catholics remain about stationary, there the number of students will remain stationary. Another element is the financial condition of Catholics. It is evident that Catholics must be wealthy enough to send their children to high school and college or to permit them to remain there even when tuition is free. This fact has influenced the increase of numbers, because there is more wealth in Massachusetts and New York than in Maryland. Another fact may be noted. The Boston archdiocese, with a Catholic population of 900,000, has but four Catholic colleges, and the Springfield diocese, with a Catholic population of 332,000, has but two Catholic colleges, whereas the Baltimore archdiocese, with a Catholic population of 270,000, has eleven Catholic colleges.

The attendance would therefore seem to depend upon the size, the proximity and the wealth of the Catholic population and upon the number of schools competing for students. It might be concluded, then, that schools should either be limited in number or better placed, and that there is no need of any revolution in curriculum or methods, especially as there are in some places more students than can be taught well, while in other places a small number do not sufficiently occupy or stimulate good teachers.

But it may be said that Catholics are going to non-Catholic schools. Do the same reasons hold for them? I believe they do. Let me quote from Dr. Burns, who has given a close study to this very point:

We have about one-half of our normal quota of collegiate students in our colleges. This proportion is not so unduly large, when all the factors that make for it are considered, and particularly the attractive power that lies in the nearness of a college to a prospective student. This will probably always remain one of the determining factors in the selection

of a college by the student, especially here in the United States. The proportion is about the same as obtains in the case of Catholic children attending the public schools. [i. e., for elementary pupils] ("Report on the Attendance at Catholic Colleges").

Note here how the chief cause is proximity, which also involves the matter of financial condition.

Dr. Burns further states that "the growth of collegiate enrolment in Catholic institutions of higher education has been more rapid than the growth of the Catholic population, and more rapid, too, than the general increase of collegiate enrolment throughout the United States" ("Catholic Education," p. 5). It is comforting to know from the same work that while the high schools of the whole country send only one in eight to get a higher education, Catholic high schools send one in every five. The transition, however, from elementary schools to secondary schools is not so encouraging. There the country saves one in every twelve, while Catholic schools save but one in every nineteen. These proportions are drawn from the figures of Dr. Burns. Anyone may compute similar ratios from the "Catholic Directory" and from the "World Almanac" or from other publications. The chief reasons why fewer Catholic children go into high school grades are again the lack of high schools near the Catholic population and the financial condition of Catholic parents. I believe, also, that more would reach the college if the grammar grades were shortened by two years. In Europe students begin Latin at twelve (See Burns: "Catholic Education," p. 177), and in this country they could be sent into high school at that age. An advance of two years in trade or profession would mean much financially and in every way, but, alas, personal experience has proved that our good Sisters do not want to let their pupils go after they have taught them so well.

Should it not be proved beyond a doubt that an increase of students will come from lowering standards of education or of discipline or of sportsmanship, before we resort to such methods for enlarging attendance at Catholic schools?

Worcester, Mass.

FRANCIS P. DONNELLY, S. J.

Government Ownership

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In your issue of December 28, there appeared an editorial headed "A New Argument for Government Ownership," from which I should like to quote one sentence: "Just why Mr. Burleson thinks the Government can succeed with the wires, when it failed with the rails, is something that the public has not been permitted to know." The clause, "when it failed with the rails," is open to debate.

The taking over of the railroads was a war measure and as such was a success. If the Government had not taken over the charge of the different roads, I would like to know whether the transportation of troops from inland States to the seaboard would have been carried on as quickly and successfully as it was under Federal control. As an individual company, under its own director, a railroad company would lose much time trying to cooperate with other companies. But with one general director, Mr. McAdoo, all this foreshadowed trouble was easily overcome, because under one director all the railroads were as one.

Federal ownership of railroads has certainly been a failure to the capitalistic class. But why worry about the loss of these gentlemen? They comprise only a small portion of the population of the United States. The class that should be considered is that of the workingman, the class of those who make up the greater part of our population, those who are the builders of our nation and who fought and gave their lives in the great war for "true democracy."

Philadelphia.

JOHN J. DRISCOLL.

[There was no objection, as has been said more than once in AMERICA, to the taking over of the railroads as a war measure, even if such action did mean added inconvenience and expense to the civilian population. The danger lies in the assumption that powers granted for the emergency of war can and should be retained in time of peace. Mr. McAdoo protests that he has no brief for government ownership, but even his modified plan of a five-year government control does not win the favor of qualified experts. Mr. Driscoll will not admit the testimony of the "capitalists" who, in his opinion, now own the railways; but the testimony of the Interstate Commerce Commission deserves at least a hearing. Testifying before a Senate committee on January 7, Commissioner Clark said:

"Considering and weighing as best we can, all the arguments for and against the different plans, we are led to the conviction that, with the adoption of appropriate provisions and safeguards for regulation under private ownership, *it would not be wise or best at this time to assume government ownership or operation of the railways of the country.* [Italics inserted.]

Mr. Clark, with the rest of us, believes in "the adoption of appropriate provisions and safeguards." But that does not imply government control, much less the menace of government ownership.—ED. AMERICA.]

Historical Gaucheries

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Continual harping on faulty presentations of Catholic American history may seem a tiresome reiteration, but an eternal vigilance is the only evident assurance of some sort of protection for future historians who must find their sources of information in the records printed during the present. The latest notable incident in this direction appears in the December issue of an Irish monthly, usually well edited and of wide international circulation. Noting the deaths of Cardinal Farley and Archbishop Ireland it says:

Cardinal Farley was of Irish birth. After his ordination, which took place in Rome in 1870, he exercised his priestly functions for sometime in his native land. He was nominated Rector of St. Gabriel's, New York, about 1884, then Rector of the American College in Rome. On the 15th November, 1895, Dr. Farley was recalled to New York as Coadjutor Bishop to Most Rev. Dr. Corrigan, and, on the death of the latter, he succeeded, on the 15th September, 1902, to the Archbishop's throne of New York.

Nothing quite so illuminative as this has happened since the late Wilfrid Ward decorated the placid pages of the *Dublin Review* with memoranda of his first American visit. Cardinal Farley for half a century was one of the most notable figures in New York, and the biographical details of his career have been printed time and again all over the English-speaking world. Why therefore quarrel with the *gaucheries* of the daily press when a Catholic publication can be found harboring on its pages such a mess as the above? Whose fault is it?

Brooklyn.

T. F. M.

The Blind Children of France

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Miss Braun, our beloved and devoted blind boarder, has just handed me a letter from New York, informing her of the charitable eagerness with which, through the columns of AMERICA, you have recommended our poor blind children to our kind friends in that city. In the name of Miss Braun and in my own I hasten to convey to you the expression of my deep gratitude.

Charged as I am with the duty of instructing these poor blind children, I am inexpressibly happy when I meet with noble hearts that sympathize with them in their sad condition. And I must acknowledge it, God's loving Providence has ever shown a special and most tender care for these helpless children. The same Providence no doubt awakened your sympathy for our

work and aroused those sentiments of generosity and zeal which caused you to make it known in your great and noble city. Again and again we thank you. Rest assured that every day our dear children will lift their prayers to Heaven for their unknown benefactors. By this note you see that we have had the happiness of being able to remain in Nancy. Life is still hard. For the food question is a difficult one in our dear Lorraine, which cannot forget the needs of her beloved Alsace just reconquered. We are in special need of fuel. But our little boys and girls are generously making every possible sacrifice for the resurrection of our beloved France.

Institution des Jeunes Aveugles,
Rue Santifontaine, Nancy (M. M.).

SOEUR MARTHE.

Practical Men and Logic

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In your issue of December 28, in R. J. McWilliams' letter I found for the first time a straw man put up and not knocked down. "Father Suarez you had better keep to teaching," said the precocious youth after Suarez had preached a sermon. This instance, that is, of preaching, says R. J. McWilliams, is one of many that some might bring forth to support the conviction that pedagogues are not practical men. "Some might," does that imply that no one ever has? No one will ever bring forward the argument that a man who has failed as a preacher is a failure as a practical man. At what time or in what age was preaching set up as the norm by which we were to judge a man as practical or theoretical? What can R. J. M. mean by practical life? How Cardinal Mercier by his "personality" furthered the "sense of righteousness" of the Allies' cause and the injustice of the German cause, I ask Mr. McWilliams to explain. What has statesmanship, military strategy, etc., to do with the proof that Wilson, Foch and Mercier are practical men? Mr. McWilliams has not as yet given us any report of their success in preaching and it is their success in this line that will save them from the realm of theory.

Again your correspondent says "be it noted these are ex-teachers." That is just my difficulty: how, if you prove ex-teachers are practical men, you can conclude that teachers are? This is new logic. "Obviously the teacher's rôle is not in itself an impediment to greater attainments in other more practical vocations." No, of course, it is not; neither is the rôle of a bootblack or a Chinese laundry man, provided these are given up and occupations pertaining more immediately to the higher attainments are taken up. This Wilson, Foch and Mercier did because "be it noted" they are all ex-teachers. In concluding I would ask Mr. McWilliams to prove that morality is a "sense of righteousness."

Winfield, L. I.

GWENDOLYN HICKEY.

The "Weird Sisters" Father

To the Editor of AMERICA:

"Give a morning glory a string," once said a clever florist, "and it will travel to the end of the world." In your issue of October 26, such a morning glory of biography meanders across a page dedicated to three "Weird Sisters" of the familiar name of Brontë. It is not they, however, but the unfortunate Rev. Patrick, their father, who is entangled in the trailing string. Did anybody ever read any account of the Brontë family in which Brontë père did not make his inevitable entrance as a crusty, morose, disagreeable old clergyman, given to eccentric firing off of pistols at back doors and *auto-da-fés* of an invalid wife's silk dresses, while she, watching the sacrifice from the window above, complacently proclaims that "at least" he never gave her an unkind word?

The author of the "Weirds" does, it is fair to him to say,

spare his readers these last details, for which relief much thanks. Why this constant vilification of the poor old gentleman? It is a strange thing, as there is nothing in either the actions or words of his children to warrant any such ideas of his character. On the contrary their attitude towards him is one of unvarying respect and affection. A man of literary tastes, though not of accomplishment, he saw and encouraged the budding talents of his young flock without a trace of a not-unnatural jealousy that they should succeed where he himself failed. He took both pride and delight in their success. He was a man respected by his fellow-clergymen and the few friends of his solitary life. Martha Brown, his old servant of many years, indignantly denied, when questioned about him, the tales of his very unclerical temper and the first-aids thereunto applied, notably the story of the silk dress. She added that he was the kindest, best and most generous of masters. As the old saw that no man is a hero to his valet still obtains, her testimony is not to be disregarded, even though the valet in this case be a housemaid.

But the "in-laws" are his great card. Everybody knows that the possession of "in-laws" is a fearsome thing, and their favorable regard is mighty in the land. In this particular there is a cloud of witnesses in his behalf. His wife's niece, Miss Charlotte Branwell, has borne testimony to his attention and devotion to his wife and the happiness of their married life. His sister-in-law, Elizabeth Branwell, took charge of his house after Mrs. Brontë's death, and lived in perfect amity and friendship with him for twenty years. The Rev. Arthur Nicholls, Charlotte's husband, to whom he was really and unequivocally disagreeable, because he did not desire the marriage, frankly announcing that his daughter could do better, was, notwithstanding this just grievance on his own part, devoted to him, remaining with him until his death six years after that of Charlotte, filling the place to him of the son who had so terribly failed him.

A figure to be revered is that of the almost blind and infirm old father, resolutely barring his daughters from the room of their drug-crazed brother Branwell, and spending alone with him the awful watches of the night, a fine old Spartan, keeping his griefs in his own heart. Then, too, he never forgot the brothers and sisters left in Ireland, and out of his slender income always found enough to help them with. In the face of these known facts, testified to by children and friends, why is it that he is still being handed down to history as an undesirable father for the "Weirds?" The only solution is perhaps to be found in a remark made by M. Heger to Charlotte, relative to a correction in one of her French exercises: "When you have once thrown the reins on the neck of your imagination, do not attempt to pull it up to reason." The morning glory is still a-travel on its string.

Baltimore.

MARY J. MALLOY.

Publicity Suggestions

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The following suggestion, which is applicable to newspapers in cities of several hundred thousand population, may help the cause of Catholic publicity. Priests or laymen should write brief advance notices of church activities and submit them, either in person or by mail, to the city editor at least twenty-four hours before the day on which they are intended to be printed. Skeletonized reports, extracts from sermons, addresses, et cetera, should be sent, not mailed, to the editorial department immediately after they have taken place. Omit adjectives and avoid the obvious, such as the following: "Parishioners of St. Joseph's Church are interested in an announcement that Bishop Blank of the Dash diocese will come to Middleville Sunday to deliver a most eloquent sermon —." The readers are

intelligent enough to realize the parishioners naturally are "interested" in the "announcement," and it is evident if the Bishop expects to preach in their city he must certainly "come" to Middleville. The readers will not be convinced the sermon is "most eloquent" until they have heard it.

City editors wish to get Catholic news. They are not anti-Catholic. Neither are they pro-Protestant. Many years "on the street" have soured them against meetings and services of every character, and they are not inclined to "waste" reporters on assemblages unless genuine news is to be found. Numerous church dignitaries, Catholic and Protestant, telephone or write to the city editor, inviting him or "a representative" to some elaborate gathering or observance. The city editor does not feel honored. He and his staff prefer their homes and families to a three-hour "ordeal" among strangers whom they suspect prejudicially of "seeking undeserved publicity."

The Catholic parishes in this city recently began a series of neighborhood lectures. The day before, I telephoned to three of the speakers, asking each to prepare 250 words for our Monday edition. One, a learned prelate, said he had not time. Another, a layman, insisted importantly that a short-hand writer should listen to his message. The third, a young priest, enthusiastically prepared extracts from his lecture and gave them to one of our messenger boys. His were printed. The other speakers were ignored.

I am not attempting to defend the newspapers' attitude. Editors know the value of news and where it may be obtained. They know how much space to devote to the proposed construction of a new edifice even if personally they nourish no regard for the Pope and his Fold. They are aware, also, that sewing circles and ladies-aid societies should not eat into the news columns. Non-Catholic clergymen are more industrious in frequenting newspaper offices and therefore they are awarded more publicity. Jewish leaders here have given the church editor, a woman, a lexicon of liturgical expressions and an explanation of feasts. The Catholics, however, have not taken the trouble to explain that Masses and Confessions are not "given" or "conducted." A few Catholic periodicals are addressed vaguely to the exchange editor, and after lying on a table for a day are dumped into a waste basket with other papers.

Toledo, Ohio.

U. T. M.

Brunetière and Mgr. d'Hulst

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The reference to the "masterly biography of Mgr. d'Hulst" in AMERICA for November 16 recalls the fact that Mgr. d'Hulst gave to Brunetière, in the *Revue d'Apologétique* of January, 1895, his first lesson in rational apologetics. Previously to this date the French publicist had been dazzled by the German sophistry that brought about the ruin of Germany. Committed to the principle of complete separation between experience and reason, Brunetière was opposing his "apologetic of the fact" to that of reason. Incessantly, he appealed to Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Von Hartmann, without understanding them. Without a sound theory of knowledge and lacking solid training in theology and science, Brunetière absorbed, blindfolded, the poison distilled by those charlatans. Like his masters, Brunetière denied all interrelation between science and Catholicism. Docile to his teachers, he denied the possibility of knowing "the thing in itself."

Brunetière could not understand that the whole philosophy of pure reason, which begins with a rigorous exclusion of experience from knowledge and rests in pure reason alone, fails utterly in the endeavor to think any real "I" whatsoever. He did not understand the sociology of Letourneau or the scientific philosophy of Léon Robert any more than the apologetic of Mgr. d'Hulst. Brunetière did not see that his dear Fichte, in confounding genus, species and universal with the

"accident," degraded the famous pure "I" itself to the rank of a mere individual. Nor had he learned that the failure of Hegel followed inevitably from the nature of his aim, the very attempt to separate reason and experience. When the French dialectician quoted Schopenhauer or Von Hartmann, he was unconscious that their alogism was derived from this principle of the exclusive subjectivity of relations by which Kant annihilated all principles of rational necessity, all possibility of reason itself.

But, in 1904, the attentive publicist discerned the French regeneration so wonderfully portrayed by the Rev. Julien Laurec. After his discovery he used his Hegelian dialectic in the service of the Church and interwove his opportunist rhetoric with Catholic sentences. The sophists of the eighteenth century attacked the Faith in the name of reason, those of the nineteenth century attacked both Faith and reason.

Santa Clara, Cal.

P. L. LOMNATCH.

Protection of Religious Rights

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The article in AMERICA of October 26 by Mr. Dudley G. Wooten under the heading "Protection of Religious Rights," in the part of your publication devoted to sociology, has interested me very much, and I would ask you to pardon my venturing to support with all the force at my command the views of the writer of the article, namely, the protection and defense, and I would add the furtherance, of Catholic rights by means of the ballot and the unification of Catholic votes.

If I may be allowed I should like the privilege of stating what the English Catholic Federation has done in this respect. In 1902 an Education act, brought in by a Conservative Government, was passed, giving sorely needed relief and State aid to all denominational schools in England. The Liberal party, which had opposed the passing of this measure of relief to Catholic and other denominational schools, seeing in 1905 a good prospect of obtaining the reins of government made no secret of their intention of repealing this act and on obtaining office, of putting Catholics back into the harrowing and unjust position we were in from 1870 to 1902. With these threats hurled at Catholics from innumerable platforms throughout the country many of us were stirred to action to defend and hold what had been secured. There being no Catholic organizations in existence in the country to unite Catholic votes for defense, the seeds of the Westminster Catholic Federation were sown by a small committee formed through the help of the columns of the *Catholic Times* of London in 1905, and a little later the Federation was officially launched. Other Catholic Federations throughout England came into existence about the same time and these Catholic "vote-uniting" organizations have helped materially to defeat the successive legislative attempts to upset the act of 1902, and we still hold what we got in that year.

I am not sure whether the powerful American Catholic Federation, and others in Australia, India, Burma, New Zealand, Tasmania, Trinidad and elsewhere, work on the same lines as the English Federations. In Australia and New Zealand federations formed under the rules of the Westminster Federation have secured many advantages and the question of education is now being tackled. In England substantial official notice is being taken of these organizations.

Our practice is this: where there is a vital Catholic interest at stake at any parliamentary, municipal, or borough council, or Boards of Guardians elections, questions approved by the Hierarchy, under whose guidance our Federations always act, are put to candidates seeking votes, and the candidates who give definite satisfactory pledges and answers to these questions are supported. The Federations are not political, they keep friends with all parties but are tied or allied to none.

London, Eng.

W. P. MARA.

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

SATURDAY, JANUARY 18, 1919

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Criticising the Government

IN speaking of the work and influence of the late Colonel Roosevelt, Vice-President Marshall recently illustrated a cardinal principle in American politics. Mr. Marshall had referred to the vigor and fearlessness with which Colonel Roosevelt advocated his political ideals and plans, however widely all might differ from the purposes of the Administration in power. "The greatest safety to the Republic," said the Vice-President, "arises from the sharp clashes of men whose ideas are as far apart as the poles."

This is a principle which few foreigners grasp, and even some Americans fail to appreciate its vital importance. It grew out of that conviction which the founders of the Republic set on record, when they forbade Congress to pass any law abridging the freedom to print, or the right of the people to assemble peaceably to petition a redress of grievances. We have no potentates in this country, but only administrators, "servants of the people," to use President Wilson's phrase. They are citizens elected by the people, dependent upon the people for their tenure in office, responsible to the people for the conduct of their stewardship. No man, from lowest to highest, is above the law; most of all, no man may seek to palliate his misdeeds by alleging the privilege of office. Our greatest executives, notably Lincoln, have welcomed criticism, and have profited by it. We choose our officials, because, presumably, we believe them fitted to serve us, and we depose them for good cause. Therefore is it necessary that we know them, and, no matter what their rank, be free to discuss their acts.

It is not easy to criticise judiciously, for criticism implies a judgment based on the discernment of merits as well as of faults. But criticism, however sharp, as long as it be kept within the bounds of truth and due respect, is necessary in the Government under which we live. There is no rancor in it, and no captiousness, even though it may seem at times, to emphasize the evil that is in men and officials, rather than the good. In this sense, legitimate criticism is a duty; we criticise, "judge,"

whenever, as good American citizens, we cast a vote. Such criticism is the salt that keeps officialdom from taint. When the American people begin to believe that office makes the man immune from criticism, we are ready for the installation of an absolute monarch.

Blame It on Grandma!

OUT in Chicago dwells a municipal judge who, in the interest of modern criminology, should at once be deposed. This judge has studied crime from the bench for many years, and last year, for some concealed reason, left Chicago to study crime in the East. He should have tossed aloft both hands in speechless admiration of our highly scientific methods of repressing crime by providing the alleged criminal with an altered environment and a perfectly new set of motives and impulses. But he did nothing of the kind. He went home to talk, and, sad to say, he discourses like a pessimist. After studying our most fashionable and best-patronized penitentiaries, he concludes that "crime waves are attributable to the old offenders who have been sent back to society through foolish coddling of habitual offenders." This surely approaches heterodoxy, but his sentence on the "mental-deficiency test" marks him out as a victim for whom the torture-chamber yawns hungrily. The mental-deficiency test, he says in good Western *argot* "is largely bunk."

The theory now is that a man who robs your house or cuts your throat is more to be pitied than blamed. He hasn't any responsibility. Such responsibility as may exist, the faddist tells us, is to be divided between you, representing society, and God.

Surely, scientific criminology has no future, if the views of this reactionary gain ground. He will be telling us next that of 100 criminals clever enough to evade the law and hoodwink the courts, only two are half-witted. If allowed to live, he may allege that a boy need not become a criminal just because he "grows up" in the criminal North or South, or East or West, "Side." If after all this heresy, he yet escapes, he may even proceed to the extremity of stating that the theory of the transmissal from parent to child, of mental and moral traits, "is all bosh." And if your criminologist is robbed of his last refuge, the chance to blame it on grandma, dust these many years, what chance is there for him or his science?

Right and Justice

THE remark, made by Mr. Wilson in his address of appreciation of the academic honors bestowed on him by the University of Turin, about the necessity of redeeming science from the disgrace brought upon it by the universities of the Central Powers, is somewhat disingenuous. Science is the same the world over. It is not radically different in Germany from what it is among other peoples. The difference lies in the fact that Germany, bent on self-aggrandizement at any cost and carried away by the lust of conquest, perverted science and used its discoveries for the murder of mankind, whereas in the other nations an innate sense of decency and

rectitude prevented them from turning the secrets of death to uses which outraged the feelings of humanity, or at least kept them from such uses except in so far as they were necessary for self-defense. But the blame or the praise for these different attitudes is not to be laid at the door of science. If other nations did not go so far as Germany went, it was due, not to the teaching of science, but to the fact that a greater residue of Christian principles remained with them than with the war lords at Berlin.

Certainly it belongs to the international community of scholars to initiate and foster those great impulses which make for right and justice, but neither one nor the other falls within the province of science, strictly so-called. Reform is undoubtedly needed in the universities, but not so much in the scientific departments, with their investigation of the forces of nature and their discovery of nature's secrets, as in those other departments whose sphere it is to lay down and elucidate the right and wrong uses of those discoveries. By all means let the laboratories be concerned with perfecting the uses of life rather than the uses of death; but it is folly to blind ourselves to the fact that this direction must be given to them by the straightforward expression of the truth about God and man, and by the exposition of those fundamental principles which underlie correct notions of moral rectitude.

Very little reflection suffices to show that the systematic elimination of God and Divine rights from every department of the non-Catholic universities has resulted in disastrous confusion on the part of educators as to the real meaning of right and justice, and, as a direct consequence, in similar confusion on the part of those who take their notions of right and wrong from these molders of public opinion. Most of the ills of the day in public and private life may be traced, directly or indirectly, to failure to recognize the existence of God, the Lord and Law-giver, and to appreciate the nature of man, his destiny and duties. Right and justice, to be indestructible, must be built on the solid foundation of truth. Intoxicated by pride the universities have tried to rule God out of court. They have failed miserably. It is high time for them for them to revise their programs.

The Danger of Tags

TAGS are vulgar and odious devices invented by hirelings to discredit respectable folk who do not see eye to eye with paid propagandists of limited vision and sinister motive. Moreover, tagging is dangerous at all times, but especially so in a terrible crisis like the present one. Yet there was never more of it than now. Knighted and benighted aliens, bespangled male citizens who in some cases, at least, have risen to the glory of a ribbon on the ruined reputations of their upstanding fellows, untruthful dowagers, apparently working for hire or a ray from the limelight, are at the mad game, as if the safety of the country depended on their score. Are our soldiers dis-

contented over long-withheld pay or slow demobilization, they are tagged Bolsheviki. Does any man dare to say that an economic boycott of Germany would ultimately result in injury to America, he is marked a pro-German. Are there some amongst us anxious that the legitimate aspirations of nations be recognized, they are "Bolshevist-anarchists," as one daintily perfumed tag has it.

The result of this is a most serious division in the ranks of our citizenry. Men have been set against men, and citizens have been set unreasonably against the policies of their Government. On one side is a noisy, factious group whom the war has left rich and scarless, pretending to be spokesmen of the Government: in opposition stands an immense number of capable but angry men, the brawn and brains of the country, set in their place and in their mood, block by block, by taggers who consider us a vulgar herd, valuable for our pelt, but for all that an inferior set destined somehow or other for the use or abuse, as the case may be, of a superior people.

Good; ay, very clever from the standpoint of the taggers and the small clientele tied to them by the slender strength of a ribbon that can be snapped without the aid of a revolution. But what, pray, of our country, is it nothing worth? Not to the taggers; the freedom of the seas has not yet been established, they can get home quickly and easily; not to their clientele; once before America was in trouble and the ancestors of most of this set transferred their goods and their affections to other lands. Be this as it may, the resentment that is burning hot in the hearts of millions of citizens is proof that our country is worth so much to the latter, that taggers had better stop their game, take thought, and add a cubit to their stature, for the accruing benefit of a new horizon. The odious process of tagging seems near a dangerous end, for "you can't fool all the people all the time," and the new vision might possibly show the hired gamesters storm clouds on a mountain top that is not so very distant. And what is distance after all, when man's heart is bruised? Russia knows, so does Germany. Ask them.

Away with Chauvinism

THE war is over: hardly, it appears to be only beginning. True, in answer to a new appeal, it has taken a new turn; but it is the more, not the less, portentous for that. For the new cry is the most popular ever uttered: the right of the workmen not to bread, but to transfiguration from economic and intellectual serfdom into the full liberty of complete manhood. This is the significance of the armies marching westward, and what will stop them? Bayonets and prison-bars never snuffed out an idea, much less stifled an ideal. And ideals are in the pit now.

Men are marching westward and calling westward, because the star of their hope has risen there and rests now over Paris, beckoning them to come quickly, before its fire burns too low for human vision. And Paris? If it is wise, it will hearken to the tread of those weary

feet and the cry of those broken hearts—peasant feet and peasant hearts, but noble for a' that.

In honest language it is stupid and criminal—in diplomatic parlance it is criminal, worse, it is stupid—to pretend that the millions of armed men who are moving here and there in Europe, like hungry locusts, are swayed by ignoble passion. Their passion is high; the manner in which they are giving expression to it, is vile; but yet, God pity them, perhaps it is the only expression they know. Their demand for such and such national boundaries may seem petty; it is not so, it is but the extenuation of a primal God-given desire that they and their fellows be free from cruel masters.

If Junkerdom, English and American, but especially English, really wishes peace it can have it. But it will acquire it in one only way, by granting the common people their rights. This denied, there can be no peace, but only a calm preceding a more frightful storm.

No peoples can be safely excluded from their rights, not even the Irish. And France, too, perhaps especially, should take notice of this. The Irish fought bravely in this war, and not for England either, but for France, for Belgium, for themselves, for freedom. Captain Esmonde, M. P., has said in the House of Commons:

I have seen, myself, buried in one grave, 400 Nationalist soldiers killed in one fight. . . . And that mournful spectacle has been repeated not after one fight, but after fifty dur-

ing the war. In the most desperate days of the war—at Mons and at the Marne—Irishmen were present at the thickest of the fighting, and battalion after battalion gave itself up to the slaughter, singing "The Bold Feiner Men," "A Nation Once Again," and other songs of the kind that the police nowadays suppress with baton charges in Ireland.

More than that, at Gallipoli the Dublins and Munsters were the first to attempt a landing. In six or eight hours some sixteen or eighteen hundred of them were dead, the rest were led by two lieutenants, the only officers alive; and not for Britain did this happen, but for France, for Belgium, for freedom. France exclaimed "magnificent" at that time, and when the armistice was signed, France gave battered Ireland the tribute of tears and consoled the poor, harried, little nation by declaring that the sacred soil of France furnishes a fitting grave for liberty-loving Irishmen. And so it does; but not all Irishmen are dead. Many, very many are alive in Ireland, in England, in Scotland, in Australia, in Canada, in Argentina, in the United States, all over the world, and to a man they are watching France to see if she will be grateful to Ireland, or chauvinistic only.

The result would not matter so much, if the structure of western civilization were not tottering to a heavy fall. And the fall will come sooner or later, if justice be not done small nations. Then the yellow man of the East will pick the bones of the white man of the West.

Literature

The Memorial Edition of Joyce Kilmer

I SAW Joyce Kilmer for the last time in June, 1917. It is not long ago; but in the brief interval his young life, which was a happy prince's progress, has come upon a glorious *finis*, and these two volumes ("Joyce Kilmer: Poems, Essays and Letters." In Two Volumes, With a Memoir of Robert Cortes Holliday. Doran) of memoir, poems, essays and letters have appeared, and are already in a third edition. In this swift succession of events there is something characteristic of Joyce Kilmer.

Like young Shakespearean kings,
He won the adoring throng;
And, as Apollo sings,
He triumphed with a song;
Triumphed, and sang, and passed along.

On the day I saw him last we had traveled together to Chicago from a college where he had given the commencement address. We reached our destination late in the afternoon, and he let me know that I was to be his guest till his train would leave for New York that evening. He had only one important task to perform in Chicago, and that was to buy a doll's bath-tub. When that business had been solemnly and satisfactorily transacted we returned to our hotel where copies of all the evening newspapers were requisitioned for information about the theatres. It amused my host to pretend that he was going to take me to the play. His delight was great whenever he found a particularly outrageous title in the columns of advertisements, advancing a hundred grotesque reasons why he thought I would be sure to like that particular play.

After a walk on the lake-front, full of talk about the Seventh Regiment, to which he then belonged, and the Sixty-Ninth, to

which he was soon to be transferred, we had our dinner. The window, which had framed a distant view of the lake in twilight when we sat down, was a dark square when we rose to go, and most of the diners had left the room. We had been together since morning; but still the talk ran fresh. There was another hour's talking in the waiting-room of the railway-station. And what high converse it was in that dingy atmosphere of stale smoke and motley crowds! He balanced deliberately all the chances of battle, felt out one after another the motives urging him onward, reviewed the ground which he and one other had traversed towards his fateful decision, calculated all ultimate contingencies. He was not afraid of death; he feared remaining; but most of all he feared—thank God, these published letters show how little he had to fear!—the moral slackening which the military transformation from civilian codes tends insidiously to superinduce in camp and active service. He left me with a brusque "Good-by" at the iron paling of the train-shed and joined the line of his fellow-travelers who very likely took him to be a prosperous young broker on a business trip. Perhaps there is no good reason why I should indulge lingeringly in this recollection in reply to a request for a review of the two volumes before me. But the indulgence is very natural if not very appropriate. And I secretly cherish a notion that this slight reminiscence may after all be the best possible criticism of Mr. Holliday's memoir and of the personality of the extraordinary man whose soul lies revealed here in prose and poetry of singularly limpid clearness and beautiful simplicity.

Mr. Holliday performed a notable achievement in preparing this excellent memoir and in putting these two volumes through the press in the short time at his disposal. Sketchy as the memoir necessarily is, it gives a true impression. A larger

biography could deepen that impression, adding wealth of details; but it might not, without injury to its subject, modify that impression materially. Mr. Holliday's strokes are swift and sure, and he has a fine sense of proportion and proper emphasis. In lieu of an ampler leisure for a longer and statelier biography, such as the personality and career of Joyce Kilmer could easily support, Mr. Holliday enjoyed two special advantages: he had known Joyce Kilmer intimately and appreciatingly, and he is master of a very excellent craftsmanship in English prose. The author of "Walking-Stick Papers" could be trusted to discover and to seize the rich opportunities afforded to a biographer by a subject like Joyce Kilmer. It is not the smallest of his merits that he has been able, though of an alien faith, to give a truthful and sympathetic glimpse into Joyce Kilmer's Catholic life. This is a Catholic biography of a delectable kind. The selection of letters was obviously determined to a large extent with the view of disclosing Joyce Kilmer's approach to the Church and the happy effects of his Catholic experience upon his art and his life.

As for the personality—gifted, amiable and high-pitched to the key of sanctity—unfolded in these pages, there can be but admiration and reverence. The friends of Joyce Kilmer can only corroborate without hesitation or reserve the impression of purity, high resolve and serene valor, which is here conveyed. The language of seeming exaggeration must be drawn upon by all who knew him in order to impart some faint idea of the singular charm which his genial humanity and austere whiteness of soul combined to form.

Friendship with an author is just as likely to influence us to underestimate his literary work as to overestimate it. Thus, when it comes to an assessment of Joyce Kilmer, the poet, I am anything but confident. A comparative judgment, confined to the field of Catholic American literature is easy enough. Joyce Kilmer's only rival in the past is Father Tabb. And it may be questioned whether the delicate preciousness of the latter poet's lovely lyrics is not more than overbalanced by the directness, force, and natural power of Joyce Kilmer. Preciousness will always leave a suspicion of insincerity and lack of seriousness which inevitably effects critical estimates of art.

Father Tabb was an aristocrat in his art; Joyce Kilmer was the most rollicking of democrats. Mr. Holliday mentions James Whitcomb Riley in comparison. Without at all disparaging Riley—whom Joyce Kilmer admired—I think Joyce Kilmer's democracy is different from Riley's and, in some respects, better. The democracy of the Indiana poet was contented with its homely surroundings, its simple pleasures, and its narrow outlook. Kilmer's democracy carries itself with an air. In his singing he scatters hints and rumors of splendid heights. He is a prophet as well as a poet. There is more stardust sprinkled over his poems.

In trying to determine Joyce Kilmer's ultimate position among the poets of his generation one can only apply certain common tests which work very well in retrospect but are by no means infallible agencies of prophecy. But they help intelligent surmise. Is Joyce Kilmer's poetry imaginative? Has it Matthew Arnold's note of seriousness? Has it any of that keen, fresh vision which Coleridge expects from genius?

The imaginative quality of Joyce Kilmer's verse is too conspicuous, I think, to be doubted or denied. He spoke and sang in glowing imagery. This is the secret of his popularity, and the reason why he was listened to in quarters where the abstract statement of his messages would not be tolerated. His poetical fabric is shot with sunshine and beautiful, unearthly lights; real sunshine, not of theatrical artifice; celestial illumination pouring through the open gates of a Divine and supernatural faith, not the wild gleams of a fantastic sorcery. He walked with saints and angels, and in his eyes the Incarnation gave humanity its splendor and its "overcoat of glory." His optimism

is obvious, but not easy; and it has the supreme advantage, which Robert Browning's optimism has not, of being rational and firmly based. Let it not be said that Kilmer's faith was visionary. It was tried by all the known tests of life and death and it emerged triumphant.

Joyce Kilmer's poetry was an imaginative transcript of his life. It may be said of him that he lived his poem before he wrote it out. And there is no greater testimony that can be adduced in proof of the seriousness of his art. I wonder whether in the whole range of English literature there are many instances of such an astonishing identity of thought and feeling in a poet's verse and in his intimate letters as these two volumes afford.

Readers of Coleridge will easily recall the following illuminating passage:

To find no contradiction in the union of old and new, to contemplate the Ancient of Days and all His works with feelings as fresh as if all had then sprung forth at the first creative fiat, characterizes the mind that feels the riddle of the world, and may help to solve it. To carry on the feelings of childhood into the powers of manhood, to combine the child's sense of wonder and novelty with the appearances which every day for perhaps forty years had rendered familiar—this is the character and privilege of genius. And it is the prime merit of genius, and its most unequivocal mode of manifestation, so to represent familiar objects as to waken in the minds of others that freshness of sensation which is the constant accompaniment of mental, no less than of bodily, convalescence.

According to the principle here so nobly set forth we are of the opinion that many of Joyce Kilmer's poems have a serious claim upon the memory of posterity. They have what Coleridge demands of all true poetry—"weight and sanity of the thoughts and sentiments, won not from books but from the poet's own meditative observation. They are fresh and have the dew upon them." "They are fresh, and have the dew upon them." This is an important phrase to cling to in an age when sophistication in the poetical art is likely to dazzle judgment. I can think of no phrase which more aptly sets off the peculiar quality of much of Joyce Kilmer's poetry.

I have said nothing of Joyce Kilmer's prose. It is the prose of a poet and of a man intensely interested in life in all its aspects. Joyce Kilmer fulfilled George Meredith's characterization of a poet as a good talker and delightful companion. He was humorous, playfully whimsical and always fundamentally sane and nicely balanced in his observations and opinions. The prose of his essays and letters, like his poetry, reflect him faithfully. How he succeeded in maintaining his calm poise and his cheerful and sprightly temper under the lash of necessary hack-work was always a mystery to his friends. Among his spiritual treasure he owned the secret of possessing his soul in patience. He gloried in the gift of laughter. In an age and in a profession of grim endeavor he strode along with the radiance of an archangel. The bright, unflecked splendor of his triumph over the trials and temptations, so tragically incident to the career of his choice, almost makes us forget the pathos of his early death. For those who wonder and surmise, he has left no doubtful clues of his boyish and pure-hearted gaiety.

O singing pilgrim! who could love and follow
Your lover Christ, through even love's despair,
You knew within the cypress-darkened hollow
The feet that on the mountain are so fair.
For it was Christ that was your own Apollo,
And thorns were in the laurel on your hair.

How inadequately I have written about a work which will long remain one of the most vivid and touching memorials of the bloodiest and most cruel war in the history of the world! It is a classic work which all Catholics can well be proud of. The memoir is a romance, an artistic and spiritual romance, which is repeated in the poems, and again repeated in the essays and letters; the thrilling revelation of a noble and

attractive personality at different angles, under different relations of light and shadow, surprise following surprise, and every surprise a confirmation of some previously received impression.

Poet and soldier and—yes!—saint; son and father, husband and lover, journalist and lecturer and accomplished man of the world, Joyce Kilmer touched many stops of life, and sweet, innocent, inspiring strains of music always responded. He met every call upon his attention and energy with cheerful seriousness whether it was tracking the secrets of armed foes through the shell-torn mazes of death or singing his joyous *sursum corda* to drooping hearts or purchasing a doll's bath-tub in a distant city for one of his little girls.

JAMES J. DALY, S.J.

"HOW SLEEP THE BRAVE!"

Plain white crosses, row on row,
Across the silent hill they go;
Here lie the friends, and there the foe,
Near to the gentle river;
Their graves are red when poppies grow
In summer, and white with winter's snow,
But they lie in close-ranked lines below,
And they lie in peace for ever.

With the dewy morn come the bugle-notes
Poured from a hundred golden throats,
And over their graves the reveille floats
Of the larks, but 'tis thrilled in vain;
For sleep is sweet when a hero dies,
And sleep eternal has touched their eyes,
A dreamless sleep, they shall never rise
To the bugle's call again.

When the sun sinks low in the ruddy west,
The farewell strains from the thrush's nest
Shall lull the sleeping heroes' rest

In a hymn to the dying day;
There they lie, brave, dauntless, true,
Palled by the heavens' gold and blue,
And the rain shall beat a soft tattoo
Where the warriors sleep in clay.

Plain white crosses, row on row,
Across the silent hill they go;
Here lie the friends, and there the foe,
Near to the peaceful river;
Their graves are red when poppies grow
In summer, and white with winter's snow,
But they lie in close-ranked files below,
And they lie at peace for ever.

SIDNEY J. SMITH, S.J.

REVIEWS

The Nemesis of Mediocrity. By RALPH ADAMS CRAM. Boston: Marshall Jones Company. \$1.00.

This is an outspoken and thought-provoking book. Mr. Cram does not merely skim over the pages of history, but he probes down to its underlying truth and principles which often escape the man who looks upon it as a bare collection of facts. "The Nemesis of Mediocrity" is a lament over the loss of great leaders in our age in all the spheres of human activity, religion, philosophy, music, education, art. Noble or cynical as they might have been, the men of the past like Metternich, Disraeli, Leo XIII, Newman, Gambetta, Gladstone, Bismarck, and others were leaders and leaders in virtue of the force and dominance of their talents and powers, not by the will of the multitude who "pitchforked" them into prominence. Our age, Mr. Cram tells us in that trenchant and picturesque style which makes one of the charms of his books, is lacking in great leadership. He

makes an honorable exception for Cardinal Mercier and for the President of the United States. Of Mr. Wilson's gifts he gives a brief but penetrating analysis. Perhaps Mr. Cram, should he revise his work, will add to these two the great Marshal Foch, and that "superannuated" French statesman who in spite of one central and criminal blunder in his life, has nevertheless risen to the exigencies of the times.

And why this mediocrity? The distinguished writer finds the cause in democracy itself, not indeed in its ideals, but in the methods which it has pursued. According to him democracy has achieved its perfect ideal, and reduced all mankind to a dead level of incapacity, where great leaders are no longer wanted or created "while society is unable of its own powers as a whole, to lift itself from the nadir of its own uniformity." He severely arraigns democracy of government, which for the last quarter of a century has neither desired nor brought out leaders of an intellectual or moral capacity above the general mass of the voters while men of strong natural powers of leadership have chosen finance or "big business" as the field of their activities. He sees little to hope for in the melting-pot process of our civilization and as sternly condemns our so-called form of popular education. He calls it "probably the worst ever devised as far as character-making is concerned. Secularized, eclectic, vocational and intensive educational systems, do not educate in any true sense of the word, while they do not develop character, but even work in the opposite direction." In such an education Mr. Cram sees religion and morals practically ignored, Latin and Greek and other cultural studies thrust aside, philosophy and dialectics ousted from the curriculum to make way for biology and business administration.

Mr. Cram always speaks with reverence of the Catholic Church. At times, by his heartfelt admiration, he all but convinces the reader that he belongs to her fold. He believes that she too has failed in true and inspiring leadership. He writes of her that "she still carries *in petto* all that was her possession, including infinite possibilities of beneficent action and influence; at present, however, this is inoperative, and with the rest of the world she stands hesitant and diffident, rejected by the majority of men, ignored by States and denied even the form of leadership."

To this, it can be answered, that whatever may be the condition of that visible leadership of which Mr. Cram is evidently speaking, there is a leadership, nobler by far than any outward guidance, of the destinies of nations, which is still preeminently hers—that of the soul. Even if in the council of the nations or in the realms of political economy, or art or sociology she might seem to be "inoperative," if she leads the individual soul to God, if in virtue of her dogma or her Sacraments she adorns the heart of the child with innocence and purity or brings the sinner back to God, she is doing the work for which primarily God destined her. The glory of external leadership is given her when God so wills, as in the days of Gregory VII and Innocent III, but is not necessary to her.

J. C. R.

Memoirs of the Pittsburgh Sisters of Mercy. Compiled from Various Sources. 1843-1917. New York: The Devin-Adair Co. \$2.65.

Seventy-five years ago seven brave women left Ireland to minister among the poor and helpless of America, then a small nation which had need of them. That need grew with the nation, and the work founded by that little band kept pace. From a humble beginning in Pittsburgh have come their schools, homes, asylums and hospitals of today, a countrywide chain of modern institutions with links in almost every State. They who came as strangers have a large place in American hearts—and justly do they hold it. During the Civil War prostrate forms in blue and grey felt the soothing touch of the Sisters' tender hands. Epidemics have raged and passed leaving them with a longer list

of martyred Sisters and leaving Americans more grateful to them still. Welcoming the homeless, bringing light into the darkness of city slums, inspiring respect for virtue in many hundred thousand children keep in benediction the name of the Sisters of Mercy. Ireland did well to send us daughters to manifest so clearly the power of charity and the nobility of woman.

In these memoirs is no complete history of what these Sisters have done; that stands in figures larger than page-print. Rather they reveal the spirit of that noble work by recounting the life story of the seven pioneers to Pittsburgh, the heroism, devotion and all the cherished anecdotes and golden moments which a glance back over the years recalls to loving remembrance. The reader, treated as an interested intimate and attracted by a modest tone is quietly brought deep into an atmosphere of womanly warmth of heart and strength of soul. The book is very timely too. We know how much the power of Irish manhood and the care of Irish mothers have done for America during its growth from an infant nation to its present commanding position. These memoirs show the same spirit living in a great work begun in this country by brave Irish maidens and the perusal of the well-illustrated volume should give its readers new grounds for hoping that Ireland's claims will be urged by America at the Peace Conference. J. F. B.

School History of the United States. By ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, LL.D. New York: American Book Co. \$1.20.

History of the American People. By WILLIS MASON WEST. Boston: Allyn & Baron. \$1.50.

Professor Hart's attractive book is intended for grammar-school work and for that reason it would have been well to introduce more historical incidents that are so invaluable in awakening in youngsters an interest in history. But the frequent introduction of highly-colored illustrations will no doubt go far to supply this omission. In view of the heated and rather recent discussion of the literacy test, it would have been well perhaps to mention it among present requirements for immigrants. In 1492 Columbus, in the diary of his first voyage, reminded Ferdinand and Isabella, who must have known his motive, that he was setting sail to go to the natives of India and their rulers, "to see the said princes and the people and lands, and discover the nature and disposition of them all, and the means to be taken for the conversion of them to our holy Faith." In 1918 Professor Hart of Harvard informs the school children of the land which Columbus discovered, that really Columbus made a mistake in setting down his motive more than 400 years ago, for "He sailed westward in the hope of making his fortune by finding some civilized people who could be plundered."

Professor West gives in his book a highly-colored presentation of Spanish colonization in America when he says that they were "all horrid transactions, nothing pleasant in any of them." These "horrid" transactions are brought out in strong contrast by a really edifying coat of whitewash splashed over the activities of English colonists. But did the latter have all the extant virtues? Let us quote as a corrective a recent historian on the question of Anglo-Saxon and Spanish colonization. "The picture of only a pitiful remnant of aborigines surviving contact with the Anglo-Saxon in North America, while seven-eighths of the population of Spanish and Portuguese America are of pure or mixed Indian blood, is an eloquent commentary on the philanthropic tendencies of the two pioneer white races which disputed the possession of the New World." Professor West's book, however, is interestingly written, in a style well suited for high-school work, and both books have well selected lists of reading matter on contemporaneous history at the ends of chapters. The idea of suggesting historical novels, is particularly happy. T. L. C.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

A correspondent of the London *Times* Literary Supplement recently called attention to a remarkable parallel between Newman's renowned appeal to the Church of England in his sermon on "The Parting of Friends" and a passage in the "Epistle Dedicatoire" to a small treatise called "The Uncasing of Heresie or The Anatomie of Protestantism, written and composed by O. A.," published in 1623. After giving a list of eminent Oxford men whose fidelity to the Church had driven them into exile, he makes the following lamentation, which certainly reminds one of Newman's famous apostrophe:

O, Oxford, Oxford, thou that hast had so manie worthy men that have fledde from the seate of Pestilence, and nurse of schisme and heresie into forraigne nations and countries, and have, for their learning, pietie, and devotion, bene highly advanced abroad. Consider, also, how many Martyrs have dyed, how manie Confessors, how many Prists have bene and are imprisoned at home, for profession of Catholike Faith and Religion. And thou which should be the lanterne of the Land, the Pillar of light, the schoole of learning, the mother of peace, the nurse of pietie; art now become the dark cloud of heresie, the foggie mist of Egypt, the mayntaine of schisme, the strength of Puritanisme, the mistresse of ignorance.

"A Poet of the Air" (Houghton-Mifflin, \$1.50), Lieutenant Jack Wright, was an eighteen-year-old boy who was killed in France early in the winter of 1918, shortly after he had won his commission as First Lieutenant Pilot Aviator in the American Aviation Corps. His mother has now published in book-form his letters that came to her from the front to give soldier-mothers courage and hope and to inspire other boys with the spirit that made it possible for her own boy to give his all for France. In truth Lieutenant Wright was more of a Frenchman than anything else, as his early years were passed in French schools. So his writing, remarkable for its maturity, breathes the spirit of France at war, and pictures the finest branch of the service with all its dash and daring. Lieutenant Wright's "idealism," however, is an idealism that is absolutely pagan and has not a trace of the supernatural about it.

"The Laughing Willow" (Doran, \$1.25), Oliver Herford's latest book of verses and pictures, contains amusing lines about the late Kaiser and his sometime loving subjects, but many of the author's cynical rhymes about feminine frailties are not funny nor are the accompanying drawings always decorous. "The Prodigal Centipede," however, is in his best manner, and so are these lines on "The Catfish":

The saddest fish that swims the briny ocean
The Catfish I bewail.
I cannot even think without emotion
Of his distressful tail.
When with my pencil once I tried to draw one
(I dare not show it here),
Mayhap it is because I never saw one,
The picture looked so queer.
I vision him half feline and half fishy,
A paradox in twins,
Unmixable as vitriol and vichy—
A thing of fur and fins.
A feline Tantalus, forever chasing
His fishy self to rend,
His finny self forever self-effacing
In circles without end. . . .

"Plane Geometry, with Problems and Applications" (Allyn & Bacon), by H. E. Slaught and N. J. Lennes, well exemplifies the modern trend in the teaching of mathematics. The former generation considered geometry as a pure science, directed almost exclusively to the development of the reasoning faculty. Modern educators require it to be made interesting, and for that purpose dilute it with imaginative and even emotional appeals. The present volume, therefore, in addition to the formal theorems of

the older text-book, introduces many historical and biographical notes, numerous photographs and designs, illustrative of the principles and their application. The problems for sight-work after each section are well selected, and the copious exercises throughout the book furnish good tests of the student's grasp of the matter.—"Ice-Breakers" (Woman's Press, New York, \$1.00) is the title of Edna Geister's collection of "games and stunts for large and small groups" of merry-makers. Some of the antics grown men and women are taught to perform are exceedingly silly and undignified, but those who have children to amuse will no doubt find the book useful.

EDUCATION

What Is the Smith Bill?

"WHAT is this Smith bill?" asks a correspondent. The question is apt. To the general public and a great many teachers, the precise purpose of the Smith bill, and particularly the means by which it intends to effect its purpose, are almost as unknown as the present locality of the Wandering Jew. The bill was analyzed in AMERICA for November 9, and while the measure has been eagerly advocated by a number of professional educators, the newspapers which gave them a voice, have contented themselves with the general and welcome statement that the Smith bill is designed "to encourage education in the United States." That is hardly a fair presentation of the case. No one wishes to discourage education, either in the United States or elsewhere; but it is barely possible that the Smith bill, despite the august approbation of Dr. Eliot, is not the Magna Charta of a new and improved class of schools. It may even be that the Smith bill will establish one thing only, and that wholly undesirable: a school system completely under the domination of the Federal Government.

ASSEMBLING THE MACHINE

SENATE bill No. 4987, introduced by Senator Smith of Georgia on October 10, 1918, is entitled, "A bill to create a Department of Education, to appropriate money for the conduct of said department, to appropriate money for Federal cooperation with the States in the encouragement and support of education, and for other purposes." The title is innocent enough, except, perhaps, for the final clause; but examination shows that this bill not only proposes something hitherto unheard of in the United States, but by discriminating against all religious schools, and schools which will not submit themselves to Washington, erects, after the war for liberty, an American educational autocracy.

Section 1 provides for the creation of an executive department in the Government, with a Secretary of Education at its head. The Secretary is to be appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, and his salary is to be \$12,000 per annum. Section 2 provides the appointment of at least three Assistant Secretaries, and "of such chiefs of bureaus, branches, and divisions, and such educational attachés to American embassies in foreign countries, and such clerks, clerical assistants, auditors, inspectors, and special agents or representatives, as may from time to time be provided for by Congress." As is evident, the new Department does not intend to allow its activities to be cramped by lack of suitably numerous attendants. The salary of the Assistant Secretaries is \$10,000 per annum. Sections 3 and 4 direct the transfer to the Department of the present Bureau of Education, and of "such educational activities already established by Act of Congress, as in the judgment of the President should be transferred," and also of "such offices, bureaus, divisions, boards, or branches of the Government, connected with or attached to, any of the executive departments, or organized independently of any department, devoted to educational matters which concern the United States as a whole, or the educational system of any State or States of the Union." The

purpose of these and of Sections 5 and 7 is to lodge with the Department all powers hitherto exercised in any way on educational affairs by the United States. Section 6 provides the appointment of a Solicitor for the Department, taken from the Department of Justice. Section 8 requires the Secretary to report to Congress annually, and "to make such special investigations and reports as he may be required to do by the President, or by Congress, or as he himself may deem necessary." Section 9 prescribes that "It shall be the specific duty of the Department of Education to cooperate with the States in the development of public educational facilities, including public health education, within the respective States."

HOW THE MACHINE WORKS

THUS the machinery is established, and the remaining sections of the bill describe its ideal operation. It will save time to note here seven specific conditions under which, exclusively, the provisions of the bill will apply. First, by Section 20, it is provided that no sum shall be paid by the Department "from any fund in any year to any State" unless an equal sum has been provided by said State, or by local authorities, or by both, "for the Americanization of immigrants, for the improvement of the public schools, for physical education, for teacher-training, or any other such purpose, as the case may be." Second, this Section also provides that no money shall, in any conceivable way, be used for the aid "of any religious or privately-endowed, owned or conducted school or college," but solely "for schools entirely owned and controlled and conducted by the State or county, or district, or local authority, as may be provided for under the laws controlling and regulating the public school system of the said State." Third, no State may share in the apportionment designed "to equalize educational opportunities," unless it requires "every public school district to maintain a legal school" for at least twenty-four weeks yearly, enacts compulsory-attendance legislation, and assigns English, exclusively, as the basic language of instruction in the common-school branches "in all schools, public and private" (Section 14). Fourth, no State may share any appropriation unless it provides "a satisfactory system of preparing teachers" (Section 18) satisfactory, that is, in the sole judgment of the Secretary of Education. Fifth, any plans adopted by the State or local authorities must be submitted to the Secretary of Education. These plans must "specifically show the courses of study" (Section 20), and must be approved by the Secretary.

In other words, unless the schools train their teachers according to the mandate of Washington, and follow courses of study prescribed by the Federal Government, they shall derive no benefit from the Smith bill.

Sixth, whenever, in the judgment of the Secretary, appropriations are not used by the State in conformity with the provisions of the act, the Secretary may forthwith "withhold the apportionment of moneys" (Section 21). Seventh, every State must file an annual report with the Secretary (Section 22), and if this report be not made, the Secretary may immediately discontinue payments provided for in the act.

LINES OF WORK, AND COST

OPERATING under these iron-clad provisos, the ninth Section points out more precisely the work of the Department. The Secretary is directed to consider the study of problems relating to the educational purposes set forth in the act; and to undertake directly research in the fields of (a) illiteracy; (b) immigration education; (c) public-school education, and especially rural education; (d) public health education and recreation; (e) the preparation and supply of competent teachers for the public schools; (f) such other matters provided for, or to be provided for, by acts of Congress. Further, he is to encourage higher and professional education and learned societies, and to promote physical and health education; and to this end, he is

to appoint such commissions as he may deem necessary. Finally, to carry out the provisions of this Section, the Secretary is authorized to appoint educational attachés to foreign embassies, and such investigators and representatives as may be needed; and "all provisions of Congress for cooperating with the States in the promotion of education, unless otherwise provided by law, shall be supervised through and by this Department." Section 10 appropriates the annual sum of \$500,000 for the payment of salaries, "and for the purpose of allowing the Department of Education to inaugurate a system of attachés to American embassies abroad to deal with educational matters." Sections 11 to 16, inclusive, proportion the allotments to be made in connection with the purposes enumerated above in this paragraph. Finally, Section 11 provides that the annual appropriation for the support of the Department, in addition to the annual appropriation of \$500,000 for salaries, shall be \$100,000,000.

A NEW AND DANGEROUS POLICY

AS is clear, the Smith bill creates one of the largest and most powerful of the executive departments. It also brings the schools into an entirely new relation with the Federal Government. Lord Bryce, in his great work, briefly dismisses the educational problem in America, because, as he remarks, by the Constitution, the Federal Government has no direct concern with the schools.

The Smith bill will delete that sentence from "The American Commonwealth." To every State, it holds out a specious lure of financial assistance, and if that be accepted, the State must, at the bidding of the Federal Government, train its teachers according to plans laid down at Washington, and revise, amend, or abolish any course of study which may not accord with the ultimate purposes of the Federal educational bureaucracy. The fathers of the Constitution believed that the schools should be ruled by those most intimately affected by them, namely, by the people of the respective States. Wisely, therefore, they conferred no powers in this respect, upon the Federal Government. The practical effect of the Smith bill will be to transfer authority over the schools from the people of the respective States to the Federal Government, thus reversing the policy which has held since the rise of the Republic.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the bill means new taxes, Federal and State. The Federal Government will gather its annual appropriation, in excess of \$100,000,000 from the people, and new State taxes will be levied upon the people, to equalize the Federal apportionment. That is, we shall purchase educational slavery at a great price. Finally, the bill specifically discriminates against all schools in which the pupils are taught the principles of Christianity, or of any positive religion. If these new schemes, embodied in the Smith bill, which tend to destroy the private school, and actually put both the training of teachers and the courses of study under complete Federal control, do not constitute "an American school autocracy," then the phrase has no meaning whatever.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

Is Federal Prohibition Constitutional?

IT is always dangerous to maintain a negative proposition: you never know when an exception will be found. Last week, in discussing the Federal Prohibition Amendment, I said that Governor Smith of New York had never been accused of acting as an agent for the breweries. That statement remained literally and wholly true for precisely twelve hours after it was penned. The dawn brought the newspapers, and with them a declaration from the indefatigable superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League, Mr. William H. Anderson. As an Assemblyman, wrote Mr. Anderson, the present Governor had always voted against local-option bills, and had opposed every honest, effective referendum. And thanking the Governor "for em-

phasizing the fact that any Republican who favors the so-called referendum is trying to betray his party into adopting the Tammany brewery program," Mr. Anderson silenced his verbal batteries.

All this is interesting, since it shows the characteristic warp of the paid professional Prohibitionist; but it is really not a contribution of value to a solution of the question. The Governor wishes to submit the Amendment to a popular vote, while the Anti-Saloon League agent prefers to take his chances with the Legislature; and that seems to be the very teeth and forehead of the Governor's offending. What is of more pertinent interest is that, as these lines are written, twenty-three States have ratified the Amendment, and that two Federal Court decisions have, for the present, at least, destroyed a strong position of the Amendment's opponents.

THE LIGHT THAT FAILED

IN November, 1918, the Connecticut Bar Association issued a report condemning the proposed Amendment as "a national menace." After stating that it constituted a precedent of paternalism which would lead to a dangerous and radical centralization of power, and that "concurrent power to enforce the article" would quicken grave dissension between the local and the Federal authorities, the report continued:

Another reason why the proposed Prohibition Amendment should not be ratified is that the Amendment has never been passed on by the Senate and the House of Representatives at Washington, and submitted to the States, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Constitution. . . . Two-thirds of both houses must concur in deeming it necessary. . . . There were six less than two-thirds of the votes in the House. In the Senate, there were on the final vote only 47 in favor of the proposed Amendment, 17 less than two-thirds of the upper house, and not even a majority.

Practically the same objections were urged by E. P. Wheeler of New York, and S. C. Loomis of New Haven, at the Baltimore meeting on December 26, 1918, of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Mr. Loomis held that a fundamental objection to the Amendment was found in the fact that it proposed to make the Constitution a manual of police regulations, "whereas that document ought to be, and so far had been limited to, a statement of the basic principles of a representative government." Further

Mr. Loomis argued that the proposed Amendment had never been properly passed on by Congress, since two-thirds of the membership of each House had not voted for it. He disputed rulings of speakers of the House and Presidents of the Senate, to the effect that two-thirds vote meant two-thirds of a quorum. The method to be pursued by Congress in proposing an amendment to the Constitution, was mandatory not permissive. (New York Times, December 27, 1918).

If this contention be rejected, it is interesting to note how small a number of men can "railroad" a resolution, proposing a Federal amendment. The members of the Senate number 96 and a quorum is 49; the House numbers 428 members and a quorum is 215; the total number of Members of Congress is thus 524. If two-thirds of a quorum may propose an amendment, that important measure is in the hands of 33 Senators and 144 Representatives, or about one-third of all the Members of Congress.

A FEDERAL DECISION

IT was against this supposedly vulnerable point that the opponents directed their first attack. In December, 1918, Albert G. Erkenbrecher, a citizen of Cincinnati, brought suit in the Federal Court, praying an injunction to restrain the Governor of Ohio from submitting the Amendment to the Legislature. On January 4, 1919, Judge Hollister dismissed the suit, holding that a two-thirds vote meant "two-thirds of a quorum."

Since the "body" is the House, and a majority of a quorum transacts the business of the House in passing a

bill, so two-thirds of a quorum passes a resolution proposing an amendment. So it seems to this Court. If the framers of the Constitution had intended by using the word "House" a different meaning from its universal meaning when applied to the ordinary business of enacting laws, it would seem that they would not have left so important a matter to conjecture and inference, and would have said, "two-thirds of the membership of the House" rather than "two-thirds of the House."

Furthermore, continued the Judge, ruling strictly on the injunction, the plaintiff would suffer no harm, since the precise point at issue could be decided quite as well after ratification by the Legislature.

THE SUPREME COURT SPEAKS

THE matter was presented from a slightly variant angle before the Supreme Court of the United States in November, 1918, and decision was rendered on January 6, 1919. The Missouri Pacific Railway had been indicted and convicted on a charge of transporting liquor from a "wet" State into the "bone-dry" State of Kansas, in plain violation of the Webb-Kenyon law. Although this law, which makes Federal Prohibition wholly unnecessary, has been sustained by the Supreme Court, the railway chose to appeal, alleging the new ground, that it had been passed over President Taft's veto by two-thirds of a Senate quorum. A further distinction which may or may not prove to be pertinent, and was not alleged in the Missouri Pacific case, is the difference between a Federal statute, such as the Webb-Kenyon law, and a Federal amendment. The opinion of the Court, adverse to the railway, was handed down by Chief Justice White. After clearly stating the ground of the action, the Chief Justice held that from the beginning, the rule has prevailed that a quorum of the Senate and the House constitutes those bodies, and empowers them to do any business. "This includes amendments to the Constitution, and passing bills over the President's veto." The Chief Justice's argument from historical precedent is thorough, and, apparently, conclusive. As the case now stands, it would seem that no relief may be entertained on this ground, by the opponents of the proposed Amendment, although the Supreme Court has reversed itself on other important issues, and will be open to new arguments on the present question.

IS IT TOO LATE?

UNDER the heading, "States that Surrender," a remarkable editorial in the *New York World* for January 9, submits a program which has often been outlined in these pages:

It is now late in the day, perhaps too late, to arouse public sentiment in opposition to this assault upon the rights and liberties of individuals and Commonwealths, but unless the people of at least thirteen States can be persuaded to stand fast for the principles on which the American Union was founded, and has endured, a far-reaching revolution will have been consummated.

This "revolution" means the end of local self-government. If the Federal Government, at the instance of a powerfully organized group of zealots, will invade this field, what will hold it back from regulating even the private life and concerns of the citizen?

With the theory and practice of Prohibition lodged in the National Constitution, we shall take leave of local self-government, and open the door to many other manifestations of centralization and intolerance. No true zealot will be content with the suppression of a single social custom. Once in command of a Federal police force, those who would regenerate mankind by arbitrary decrees, will find in amusements, manners, dress, domestic affairs, and religious faith and observances, new fields of activity.

And how has this un-American menace been allowed to grow? Simply because of popular indifference in the face of an organized band of intemperates.

It used to be said that the liberty of the American people was safe in the custody of the people. A small, but persistent band of sectarians is showing how serious that delu-

sion was. State after State is surrendering principles of local self-government, home rule and individual responsibility, which used to be considered safeguards of freedom. And the worst of it is that there is hardly a dissenting voice.

Ovid says something to the effect that when a body is near death, it is too late for jalap and squills. Possibly, Federal Prohibition might be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, but if precedent goes for anything, and it means much, that august body will not sustain the contention that a two-thirds vote means two-thirds of the total membership of the Congress. Can we find thirteen States brave enough to rebuke and confound the zealots? Thirteen colonies once embodied the voice of a people, clamoring for the right of self-government. Perhaps history will repeat itself.

P. L. B.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Free Scholarships

THE Dean of the College of Agriculture in Notre Dame University has put at the disposal of the editor of AMERICA ten free scholarships to be awarded as he sees fit. Each scholarship will consist of the price of four years' tuition, or \$120 annually. For those young men who may find it difficult or impossible to provide for their other expenses, the Notre Dame Students' Employment Bureau will secure work in South Bend. Those who avail themselves of this very munificent offer will find classes, suited to their needs, regardless of their previous training, but they should arrive at the college not later than January 31. Agriculture, especially when taken up according to scientific principles, offers such exceptional opportunities for interesting and lucrative lifework, that this offer should have a strong appeal for young men of ambition.

"Pitiless Publicity"

APPARENTLY pitiless publicity has not as yet passed beyond the stage of a "consummation devoutly to be wished." Mr. Ernest Hamlin Abbott, a staff correspondent at the Peace Conference for the *Outlook*, New York, writes to his paper under date of December 10, to say:

I received your cable asking me to get in touch with Mason. I had already looked him up. He had anticipated your request. In some respects the lid is screwed down tighter here now than when the fighting was on. Mason is making arrangements which I hope and believe will work out satisfactorily.

Communications are very irregular. It took three weeks for one of your cables to Mason to come through. Yesterday, December 9, I got a letter from L. dated November 18; today I got a letter from M. dated November 2.

AMERICA's correspondent, Mr. Joseph C. Walsh, late of the *Montreal Herald*, and all other newspaper men, are experiencing like difficulties. Why? Now that "the war is over" cannot Americans be trusted to do justice to problems in which they are as vitally concerned as official censors of news?

A Crucifix in England

ONE little corner of England is just now greatly disturbed over a representation of Christ. The Chancellor of the Carlisle Consistory Court was petitioned to allow a crucifix on a memorial window, and the conscience of the good man pricked him into the following peculiar reply:

The needs of mourners might well have been directed to a higher plane, not to the Christ dead and thus painfully pictured, but to the Christ living, risen, glorified. . . . This painful subject placed in a conspicuous part of a parish church, before a mixed congregation of men, women and children would be offensive to some, distressing to others and of doubtful profit to the rest.

This is a splendid appeal to the mob but a poor show of reverence to the Christ.